



6: Liburg. 687 P - 2 Laurence

16:

Lidurg

THE

NEW

EDITION

OF

THE

NEW

EDITION

OF

THE

NEW

EDITION

OF

THE

NEW

T H E
Second Part
O F
LAY-BAPTISM Invalid:
Shewing, That
The Ancient Catholick Church
Never Had Any
ECCLESIASTICAL LAW,
TRADITION, or CUSTOM,
FOR THE
Validity of Baptisms

Perform'd by Persons who Never were Com-
mission'd by Bishops to Baptize.

All Prov'd from the Reverend Mr. *Bingham's*
Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, and from
other Evidences not produc'd by that Historian.

By the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

Other Foundation can no Man lay, than that is laid. — Ye are built upon the Foundation of the APOSTLES, — Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner-Stone. 1 Cor. iij. 11. Ephes. ij. 20.

Quam Periculosum sit autem in Divinis Rebus ut quis cedat jure suo & potestate, Scriptura Sancta declarat, cum in Genesi Esau *Primatus* suos inde perdiderit, nec recipere id postmodum potuerit quod *semel* cessit. Cypr. Epif. ad Jubaian. 73. p. 151. Paris 1548.

London : Printed for H. CLEMENTS, at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCXIII.



BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS

2. I. **A** 2 I have been much obliged to you for the
willing and Dispute about Words and Things
that have no Relation to the Merits of the
Cause; as the Controversy; and as I have
all along Consulted the Just Honor and Reputation of the
Clergy, and upon a Principle of Great Reverence and
Esteem for their Sacred Character, have been exceeding
Sorrowful and Fearful of saying and Publishing any thing
that might reasonably be interpreted to be disrespectful or
injurious to any of them, from much lower they have
(some of them) Differed from me; 2. I resolve (by God's
Grace) still to preserve the same Temper and Disposition;
and in the following Remarks to Avoid the great Incon-
venience of Troubling my self and the Reader with Strife
and Wrangling about mean, little, pedantic Things,
which serve only to Cloud and Obscure True Truths,
which are proper to Plea for, and Dispute to Order.

3. II. If any of my Opponents have been that Trouble-
some to their Readers in this Dispute, I am perform'd
of that kind will meet with the Deserv'd Censure of the
Discerning and Judicious; and if to make their Affair-
ers go off the Better, they have thought fit to treat me
with Incontinency; I shal be only plying them
A 2



THE PREFACE.

§. I. **A**S I have hitherto avoided all unnecessary Cavillings and Disputes, about Words and Things that have no Relation to the Merits of the Cause, in this Controversy; and as I have all along Consulted the Just Honour and Reputation of the Clergy, and upon a Principle of Great Reverence and Esteem for their Sacred Character, have been exceeding Scrupulous and Fearful, of Saying and Publishing any thing that might reasonably be interpreted to be disrespectful or uncivil to any of them, how much soever they have (some of them) Differ'd from me; So I resolve (by God's Grace) still to preserve the same Temper and Disposition; and in the following Remarks to Avoid the great Impertinence of Troubling my Self and the Reader, with Strife and Wrangling about mean, little, pedantick Things, which serve only to Cloud and Obscure That Truth, which we profess to Plead for, and Discover to Others.

§. II. If any of my Opponents have been thus Troublesome to their Readers in this Dispute, their Performances of that kind will meet with the Deserved Censure of the Discerning and Judicious; and if to make their Assertions go off the Better, they have thought fit to treat me with Incivility; I pass it by, with only pitying their
A 2
Tempers,

Temper, and advising them to fix their Eye more steddily upon the Great Matter it self which is now in Debate; and then they'll see that 'tis too Noble a Subject to be mix'd with such an Alloy; and that it will sooner be determin'd by separating from our Reasonings about it, all ungenteel Reflections upon Persons, and all Partialities in favour of some, who are Deeply concern'd in its Consequences.

But tho' I resolve to be as Civil to my Opponents as the Merits of the Cause will allow, yet they must not Expect that I will Compliment any of their Errors, or that I will be so soft and kind to their Dangerous Notions, as to skreen and hide them from that just Reproach which is due to them. If my Learned Adversaries make false Arguments to defend Error, I shall not Esteem such their Methods to be only Mistakes, but something worse, considering the Greatness of their Knowledge; and if my Endeavours to Expose their false Reasonings be unpleasant to them, I care not; since Important Truths of a Spiritual Concern are infinitely more valuable to me, than the Pleasure and Satisfaction of even the Greatest of Men, who stand in publick Opposition to them.

The Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid, whatever his Name is, has abundant Reason not yet to publish it in Print; and therefore in this Discourse will not answer Mr. Bingham by the Name of Lawrence, tho' that Reverend Historian has been pleas'd uncivilly to print that Name at large in his Title-Page, &c. without the Leave or Consent of the Person, whom he supposes and asserts to be the Author he aims at. But not to detain the Reader any longer from the Matter in Hand, I will here, once for all, shew him, First, What it is that the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid do's insist upon; And, Secondly, What those Things are, which were never design'd to be insisted upon in his several Treatises. And,

s. III. First, he insists upon it, that the Pretended Baptism which is administer'd by Persons who never were Commissioned to Baptize, or who never were impower'd, never authoriz'd to Baptize, is Null and Void, and no Christian Baptism: This is the Subject of his * Treatises of Lay-Baptism already published; this their Design to prove; and this Baptism, the Author calls Lay-Baptism; Baptism destitute of a Commission; unauthoriz'd Baptism, because done by such as were never authoriz'd: And in several Places of those Treatises he calls this false Baptism, by the Name of Invalid Baptism, upon Supposition that he has prov'd it to be so. So that throughout those his several Books, the Terms of "Lay-Baptism, Unauthoriz'd Baptism, and Invalid Baptism," do all mean this one and the same Thing, Baptism by those who never were Commission'd, Authoriz'd, or impower'd to Baptize. This he thought he had sufficiently declared before; especially by adding a new Definition in his 2d Edition of Lay-Baptism Invalid: But that no one may henceforward mistake his Meaning, he thinks it very pertinent to declare it once more, in Answer to the Vth Page of Mr. Bingham's Preface, where he says, and reckons it a great Error, that I frequently "Confound the Terms of Lay-Baptism, Unauthoriz'd Baptism, and Invalid Baptism, together, &c. For, any Man that does but look into the Treatises before mention'd, may easily see, that all which has been there said upon this Subject, is confin'd to Baptism by Persons never Commission'd at all to Baptize: Are not these Lay-Baptisms? Sure if such Persons are not Laicks, then there are no Laicks at all in the Church.

* Lay-Baptism Invalid. Sacerdotal Powers. Dissenters Baptism Null and Void. The Bishop of Oxford's Charge Consider'd.

Are

Are not such Baptisms Unauthoriz'd, i. e. never Authoriz'd? Certainly they are. And when they have been prov'd to be Invalid, is it any wrong confounding of Terms to call them Lay, Unauthoriz'd, and Invalid Baptisms? What is it then that Mr. Bingham requires? What Name would he have us give to Baptisms perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd, if we must not call them Lay-Baptisms? This cavilling at Words discovers an Inclination in him to make Things look like Errors, when they are so far from being so, that they are exactly right and just; and let him prove the contrary if he can.

*§. IV. Secondly, Those Things which were never design'd to be determin'd Negatively or Affirmatively in the several Treatises written by the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid, are these, 1st. A supposed Power of Bishops [which some say they have] to Commission Laymen to Baptize in Cases of Extremity. Whether Bishops can or cannot so commission Lay-Men, the Author (whatever his private Opinion is about it,) had no Mind publickly to determine, because his Business was only with those, who were without all Dispute never commission'd by Bishops, in any Respect whatsoever, to Baptize; and so is utterly foreign to the other Question, How far Bishops have Authority to impower or commission Men for Sacred Ministrations. I have in several Places indeed, shew'd the Danger of their endeavouring to vest Lay Men with Power to Baptize, in Case of suppos'd Necessity; I have also oppos'd some pretended Arguments, which have been advanced to prove, that Bishops have such a Power to authorize Lay-Men; and even in this Book I have shew'd, that the Catholick Church has determin'd nothing in Favour of such a Power: But yet in all this I will not concern my self so far, as publickly to determine whether Bishops have or have not such a suppos'd extensive Power for Cases of Extremity; and let Men take which Side of
the*

The Preface.

v

the Question they please, the Truth I am concern'd about will stand good, that pretended Baptism by Persons never commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, [who are therefore certainly Lay-Men] is utterly Null and Void. If Bishops can really vest their own Lay-Men with Power to Baptize, in want of the Clergy, then 'twill follow, that such Lay-Men so Baptizing, are not Laicks in that Act of Ministration, because vested with a Priestly Power for that Purpose, by the Hypothesis: But this Proposition wants to be prov'd; and I care not whether it can be prov'd or no, for it no ways affects the present Controversy; since there must be always Bishops in the Church to vest Men with Commission to baptize, how Contracted or Extensive soever the Power of Bishops is for this Purpose; and since there can be no valid Ministration of Baptism without an Episcopal Commission really given to the Baptizer: Which is the great Proposition I am concern'd for.

2dly, The Validity or Invalidity of some ancient heretical and schismatical Baptisms, were not design'd to be insisted upon by that Author; because they were also different from the Case before us; their Baptisms were perform'd by Persons who had been commission'd by Bishops to Baptize; and so whatever the Nature of their Baptisms was, it had no Comparison with that sort of Baptism which is evidently and professedly perform'd, not only by those who were never Episcopally Commission'd, but also in Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, or the Apostolical Order it self. A new Usurpation this, of so monstrous a Nature, that whatsoever may be fairly pleaded in behalf of the Ancient, Heretical, and Schismatical Baptisms, cannot be said in Defence of these, as will be seen in due Time.

S. V. In the Historical Account of those Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, I have indeed express'd a great Value and Esteem for St. Cyprian and his Colleagues

Ecclesiastical Laws or Canons against them. Laws so strict, as that they Condemn'd all such Baptisms to be Null and Void. And why should not the Spiritual Supreme Governors of the Church, have Power to make such Laws, as shall so far limit and restrain the Commission they give to Ordain'd Persons, that when they presume to do any thing by Virtue thereof, in Heresy or Schism, their Acts shall be wholly Null and Void by Virtue of such Laws? St. Cyprian and his Colleagues did make Ecclesiastical Laws to this purpose (as we shall see hereafter) and in so doing I reckon that they acted like themselves, and took the most effectual way to beat down Heresy and Schism: If the rest of the Churches, who in their Discipline differ'd from St. Cyprian and his Colleagues, had made such Laws as they did, those Laws being in such case Universal, might in all likelihood, have preserv'd the Unity of the Church, and prevented the many Dreadful Heresies and Schisms which afterwards ensu'd: But these Churches would not concur so far with That Blessed Martyr; They would not agree with him, to make frustrate and void, during their Heresy and Schism, the Commissions, once receiv'd by their Heretical and Schismatical Subjects; and because they were not so Null'd by such wish'd-for Laws, therefore their Ministrations were by those Churches esteem'd to be Good and Valid in themselves, tho' the Persons concern'd in them, both Administrators and Receivers, were tainted with the Sinful Circumstances of Heresy and Schism; Insomuch, that tho' these Churches did not declare those Baptisms to be Null and Void in the Administrations, for want of Commission in the Administrator, yet they reckon'd, that the Spiritual Graces were impeded, or hinder'd from Descending on the Baptized, by reason of the Sins of Heresy and Schism, till the Baptized return'd to the Unity of the Church, and as Penitents, receiv'd Absolution by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, and then the Spiritual Graces of Baptism were reckon'd to take effect. Thus those Churches held such Baptisms

Baptisms to be valid in themselves as to their Ministration, and so do I too, because there was no want of Commission; and tho' I submit to this not so strict Discipline as that of the Cyprianick Churches; yet I should value and esteem St. Cyprian's Discipline, rather than this, if it were establish'd in the Church: But this my preferring one before the other, is no Argument that I therefore esteem to be null and void, what I think not so perfect in its Circumstance as the other.

S. VI. Mr. Bingham says that the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid's* "Notions concerning the Invalidity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptism, do, in their direct and immediate Consequence --- unchurch and unbaptize the whole Church of England, unless it can be shew'd that we had our Baptism from some other Church originally, than from the Heretical and Schismatical Church of Rome," Preface p. V. This indeed is a momentous Consideration, and of so mighty Importance, that it would have been but just in Mr. Bingham to have nam'd that Author's black Notions in his own Words, and at the same time too as he brings in so heavy a Charge against him; and prosecutes it to the utmost for almost two Pages together, without so much as naming One of those dismal Notions and Arguments he talks of. But to accuse heavily and positively a long while before we come to a Trial of Men's supposed Crimes, has something in it of Policy and Cunning to win upon the Faith of the credulous. But by what I have already said in this Preface, and shall further say in the Prosecution of this Discourse, the Reader may easily see, that I have no such Notions as tend to the unchurching and unbaptizing of our Church of England, or indeed of any other Episcopal Church in the World, that retains the Essentials of Christ's Holy Institutions, as our Church most certainly does: And if Mr. Bingham, or any other, can prove that I have
any

any such unchurching Principles, I will publicly repent of and retract them ; but if he cannot prove this, he is in common Justice bound to acknowledge his Mistake (to make the best of it) and publicly to take off that Reproach, which he has so openly laid on one, who hopes he has been very far from deserving it, from his or any other Clergyman's Hands.

§. VII. " Our Superiours legally assembled in Convocation, before they acquiesce in this Gentleman's Proposal, " Whether it might not be proper " to have a peculiar Form of Confirmation or Imposition of Hands, for such as were baptized by Hereticks and Schismatics, upon their Return to the Unity of the Church, — &c. without " (what he calls) Rebaptization, " Preface Pag. VII. 'tis humbly hop'd will in their great Wisdom distinguish the Baptism of such Hereticks and Schismatics as have been Episcopally, i. e. validly ordain'd, from that of others who never received any Episcopal, i. e. valid Commission at all. All Forms of Imposition of Hands that are yet to be found in primitive Church-History, belong only to Persons baptized by the former Sort of Hereticks and Schismatics; and there is not one ancient Precedent of a Form of Confirmation, of such as were pretendedly Baptiz'd by the latter Sort. So that the Peculiar Form propos'd with respect to these, will be Peculiar indeed ! and wholly new, without any Example or Precedent in the Ancient Church of Christ. I mention this, only with Submission to that Reverend and Learned Body of the Clergy, especially because I find, that our Historian makes no Proviso whatsoever for this necessary Distinction ; tho' there is plainly abundance of Reason for it ; because otherwise, a Commission once received, and not vacated, will be reduc'd to an Equality with a no Commission ever received at all ; while the Ministrations of those who have a Commission, will be Equivalent to the Mi-

Ministrations of those who never had one, and thereby the Word of God himself will be made of no Effect.

§. VIII. Besides, 'tis very observable, that the Form of Confirmation which Mr. Bingham subjoins to give some Light into this Matter, pag. VIII. is not more ancient than the Ninth Century, and by Consequence wants the true and noble Character of what is Catholick, i. e. has Antiquity, Universality, and Consent; and he might with as much Reason have given an Instance of Image-Worship and Invocation of Saints, from the Second General Council of Nice, about the Year 787. who pretended more Authorities from Fathers and Scripture too, for the establishing of those Errors, than our Reverend Historian can produce, for the Confirmation of Persons pretendly baptized, by such as never were Commission'd to Baptize; for indeed he can produce no Authority at all for that Sort of Confirmation. I say our Reverend Historian might as reasonably have produc'd, the Authority of that Council, for the establishing of those Idolatrous Practices, as this Form of Confirmation for the Exemplar of a Form to be made, to confirm the False Baptisms of those, who have been only washed or sprinkled by our Hereticks and Schismatics, who were never commission'd to Baptize, if his Exemplary Form had been us'd to confirm such false Baptisms, as indeed it was not; for the Form he produces, does not, throughout the whole Ceremony and Prayers, make the least mention of any Defect in the Baptism it self, before received by the Confirm'd Person; and as for the Prayer of Confirmation's, beseeching God to give the Person "the Seal of the Divine Union, and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit", it contains no more in Substance, with Reference to the preceding Baptism, than what is as proper to be said over another, who was baptiz'd by an Orthodox Priest in the Unity of the Church; as neither is there in the following Words of another Prayer, which speak of the Confirm'd Person

Person as now "Perfect and Consummate with the true Faith, in God, and with the Seal of His Holy Unction." For Confirmation was always reckon'd by the Church to Perfect and Consummate with the True Faith, and with the Seal of God's Holy Unction, even all validly baptiz'd Persons in the Church it self. So that here is nothing in all this Form, peculiar to any Imperfection in the Baptism it self, before receiv'd, but only in Reference to the Errors of the Person who was received into the Communion of the Church: And this might have been well put into the Form, even for a Person in all Respects rightly baptiz'd before, if he fell into any dangerous Errors, as all Hereticks most certainly did; and 'tis notorious they were Episcopal Persons; and therefore, a Form to be compos'd after the Example, and in Pursuance of the Design and Purpose of that Form, will not be sufficient to confirm Persons supposedly baptiz'd by Hereticks and Schismaticks, who never were vested with a Divine Commission. As is the Case of our Anti-Episcopal Dissenters Baptisms.

§. IX. I know some of my Readers will expect, that I should say something to Mr. Bingham's Appendix; but I must tell them, that to speak particularly to every thing that Gentleman has been pleas'd there to insinuate, and which is foreign to the Merits of the Cause, is to spend Time and Paper to no Purpose, and to incur the just Displeasure of the Candid and Judicious, without doing any Service to others who are not so. What is worthy of an Answer, and deserving of the Reader's Notice, I shall remark upon [as hereunder] only in this Preface, referring to the several Pages of the following Treatise, where my Answers are more fully to be found.

Our Reverend Historian's Observation [in his 141st Page] upon a Passage in my Discourse of Sacerdotal Powers, Chap. V. Pag. 120. is very just and right, that instead of these Words, namely, "Those whom a

"La-

“Laick Baptizeth are to be Rebaptized; but those
 “whom an *Arian* Priest Baptizeth are not to be
 “rebaptized. Therefore an *Arian* Priest is not a
 “Laick. This Argument so confounded Hilary the
 “Deacon that he was forc’d to deny the *Major*, which his
 “Master Lucifer had granted before, viz. That those
 “whom a Laick Baptizeth are to be Rebaptized.” It
 should have been thus:

“This Argument so Confounded Hilary the Deacon,
 “that he was forc’d to Deny the Assumption [or *Minor*]
 “which his Master Lucifer had Granted before; viz.
 “That Those whom an *Arian* Priest Baptizeth, are
 “not to be re-baptized.” And so ’tis mended in the Se-
 cond Edition of *Sacerdotal Powers*, p. 76. and I thank
 Mr. Bingham for the Notice, that I may not let any unde-
 signed Slip [as this was] pass uncorrected by me.

Mr. Bingham’s 141st Page concerning St. Jerom’s
 Notion of the Validity of Lay Baptism, is largely Answer’d
 in Page 120, &c. of this Treatise.

His 142^d Page of St. Chrysostom’s Assertion concern-
 ing the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is Answer’d in Page 114.

His 142, 143, 144 Pages, of St. Basil’s Opinion, is An-
 swer’d in Page 109.

His Demand in Page 145. “In what Writing of
 “the *Stephanians* I find this Maintain’d, That They
 “who had received Baptism from Hereticks or Schisma-
 “ticks, were in a State of Salvation? Is nothing but
 Captiousness and Cavilling, for himself and all who
 have look’d into St. Cyprian’s Works do know, that Ste-
 phen Bishop of Rome did hold, that such Baptiz’d Per-
 sons were in a State of Salvation, for they esteem’d
 them to have been Validly Baptiz’d, and therefore re-
 fus’d to give them any other Baptism, and quarrell’d
 with St. Cyprian, &c. for judging otherwise; and
 sure they who held Men to have been Validly Baptiz’d,
 esteem’d them to have been in a State of Salvation,
 otherwise what signified the Validity of their Baptism?
 But for further Answer to this Captious Question, the
 Reader

Reader may find enough in St. Cyprian's Epistles to Jubaianus and Pompeius, and in Firmilian's Epistle to St. Cyprian; in all which the Arguments of Pope Stephen and His Followers, are particularly mention'd, and endeavour'd to be Answer'd by St. Cyprian and Firmilian; and tho' Mr. Bingham makes himself Ignorant of the Stephanians maintaining, "that they who had received Baptism from Hereticks or Schismatics were in a State of Salvation." Yet as Learned * and Judicious an Author as any Modern Writer whatsoever, has expressly asserted that they affirm'd, "That all Catechumens who dy'd unbaptiz'd, were not therefore damn'd; much less those who had received Baptism, tho' from Hereticks or Schismatics, which is the very Argument of the Stephanians, that I have mention'd in the Place on which Mr. Bingham makes his Remark, and from which alone he Deduces his Captious Question.

His next Remark, p. 145. is, That I "would insinuate, that Athanasius was of Cyprian's Opinion, and rejected the Baptism of All Hereticks in General;" Which he inferrs from my saying, "That Athanasius in the 4th Century rejected the Baptism of Hereticks." The falseness of his Inference discovers it self; for, "the Baptism of Hereticks," which are my Words, do not mean the "Baptism of all Hereticks in General," as He would represent; and He would think it very odd and unbecoming me, if I should thus force some Words of his, which are as capable as mine are of so Universal a Sense: For Example, he says in his 34th Page, "The Council of Nice never made any Decree about the Re-baptization of Persons baptiz'd by Laymen, but only by Heretical Priests."

* See Vindication of a Discourse of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, Page 304.

Now should I from hence infer, that Mr. Bingham "would insinuate," that the Council made a Decree "about the Re-baptization of Persons baptiz'd by all Hereticks in General," would not Mr. Bingham have just Reason to complain of the Incivility of such a forc'd Inference? And would not the Judicious Reader also have reason to find fault with the Impertinence of thus imposing upon his Time and Patience? But this is trifling, and I beg the Reader's Pardon for concerning my self thus much with only a Dispute about Words. Mr. Bingham is pleas'd in this place to say that Athanasius "rejects the Arian Baptism as Invalid; — and that he allowed the Baptism of all others;" and for this he refers you back to his Chap. I. Sect. 20. as if he had there prov'd it; when behold in that very Chapter and Section he says expressly that Athanasius "concludes the same of the Manichees and Montanists, and Samosatzenians," viz. that "their Baptism was of no Effect." And let the Reader judge whether this is "allowing the Baptism of all others but the Arians." This Inconsistency with himself, is not the only One that Mr. Bingham has committed; as will be seen in the following Treatise.

His 145th Page, where he Remarks on a Passage I cite out of Pacianus, is Answer'd in Page 98.

His 146th Page, concerning Optatus, is already Answer'd by what I said just now on his Remark concerning St. Athanasius.

He acknowledges, Page 146, that my Reflections on the Council of Eliberis are just enough: But

In his 147th Page he says, I am not so just and accurate in my Reflections on the First Council of Arles; Because, 1st, I "Diminish the Authority of this Council by following the faulty Subscriptions [says he] which make but 33 Bishops to have been at it; Whereas it was [says Mr. Bingham] a Plenary Council of the Whole Western Church, as St. Austin calls it, consisting of 200 Bishops, &c.

But

But in Answer to this, the Learned Du * Pin affirms, that "This Council was compos'd of 33 Western Bishops, with some Priests and some Deacons." And he gives good Reasons for this, against Baronius, and a Mistaken Text of St. Austin, in these Words: "Baronius thought, that this Council consisted of 200 Bishops, which he Grounded upon a Passage of St. Austin, in his Book against the Epistle of Parmenianus, Ch. V. but he misunderstood that Passage; for there he do's not speak of the Council of Arles, but of the Council of Rome, which consisted only of 19 Bishops, and not of 200, as they are reckon'd in the Text of St. Austin, according to the Common Editions; but this Place has been restor'd in the Last Edition, by a Manuscript in the Vatican Library; and instead of reading it as it was, "Ut DUCENTOS JUDICES, apud quos victi sunt, victis litigatoribus credant esse postponendos, It is now thus restor'd," "Ut CONTRA JUDICES, apud quos victi sunt, victis litigatoribus credant, &c. There are but 33 Names at the Head of the Council's Letter; but of these 33, there are 4 Priests and 1 Deacon, and 6 Exorcists. They endeavour to prove, that there was a greater Number of Bishops at this Council, because Constantine in his Letter to Chrestus, and the Second Council of Arles testify, that there were Bishops in it from all Parts of the World. But these 19 Bishops are found to be from all Parts of the West, and so it is not necessary to admit a greater Number of them, to verify what is said by Constantine, and the Fathers of the Second Council of Arles. Ado says that

* Du-Pin's Eccles. Hist. 4 Cent. p. 247. & Council of Arles.
Note b.

“ 600 Bishops were present at this Council, but
 “ this is in no wise probable.” *Thus far Du Pin.*

*And now I would ask our Reverend Historian, what
 if 1000 Bishops were there present, do's Their Determi-
 nation concerning the Baptism of Hereticks in the Name
 of the Trinity, that they should not be re-baptiz'd, amount
 to any thing in our present Dispute, about Baptism by Persons
 who never had an Episcopal Commission to Baptize? Were
 those Hereticks, such Baptizers, or no? Were they meer
 Laymen, or were they in Episcopal Orders?*

2dly, *He says in the same Page that I am mistaken,
 when I say, “ That the Ancient Hereticks and Schif-
 “ matics, whose Baptisms that Council allow'd,
 “ had commonly receiv'd Ordination from the
 “ Hands of some Catholick Bishop or other—
 “ and that therefore those Baptisms were not Anti-
 “ Episcopal.” And the Reason he gives why these are
 Mistakes, stands thus: “ For [says he] many of the
 “ Heresies and Schisms of those Times had a Long Suc-
 “ cession of False Bishops of their Own, who were
 “ not Ordain'd by Catholick Bishops, as the
 “ Novatians, &c. who certainly did not act by any Au-
 “ thority of the Catholick Church, whilst they were
 “ out of the Holy Catholick Church, and in Manifest
 “ Opposition to it.” — They were Anti-Episcopal pro-
 “ perly speaking, — Anti-Episcopal Baptisms were
 “ in some Sense, the Subject of that Council, &c.*

*In Answer to all which, Mr. Bingham doubtless knows
 that the Novatians and other Hereticks and Schismaticks
 began their Heresies and Schisms in Episcopacy; he can-
 not fairly deny that they had their first Bishops ordained and
 consecrated by Catholick Bishops; That these first here-
 tical and schismatical Bishops so ordained, had not their
 Orders null'd and voided by those Churches who allowed
 their Baptisms; That the Ordinations perform'd by these
 Heretical and Schismatical Bishops were therefore Episco-
 pal;*

pal; and consequently the long Succession was truly Episcopal, having been begun by Catholick Bishops, and handed down successfully by an unrepeal'd, not vacated Episcopal Commission; hence [the Commission being still but the same that was at first given by Catholick Bishops, namely, Episcopal.] The Baptizers who were ordained by Virtue of this one and the same Episcopal Authority, are truly said to have "received Ordination from the Hands [viz. Convey'd to them by their Ordainers from the Hands] of Catholick Bishops", who vested their Ordainers with the same Power to ordain, which the Catholick Bishops themselves were vested with. Mr. Bingham says, "This was a long Succession of False Bishops". If by False Bishops he means Bishops who were false to the Trust repos'd in 'em, [as all Hereticks and Schismatics most certainly are] then there will be no need to dispute about this Term; but if by "False Bishops" he means Counterfeit or no Bishops, who had no real Episcopal Authority conferr'd on them; The Churches who esteem'd their Ordinations to have been Valid, and therefore did not pronounce them Null, are contrary to him; witness the Great Council of Nice, &c. And therefore in the Sense of those Churches they were not "Anti-Episcopal, properly speaking," as Mr. Bingham would have it; neither were their Baptisms Anti-Episcopal Baptisms. But I must refer the Reader to what I have said more upon this Subject in Page v, vj. of this Preface, and in Page 193, &c. of the following Treatise, which is all that I think needful to say to him, in Answer to every thing he has advanc'd about Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, in his Scholastical History, and the Appendix thereto.

In his 149th Page he is pleas'd again to Cavil at the Term unauthoriz'd so often made use of by me: In answer to which I tell him once more, that by unauthoriz'd and uncommission'd," I constantly design what all Englishmen

men usually mean by such Words ; namely, not authoriz'd, or never authoriz'd ; not commission'd, or never commission'd : And Mr. Bingham might have sav'd himself and his Reader too a great deal of Time and Trouble, if he had but rightly consider'd my V^lth Definition in Page 24, of the 3^d Edition of *Lay-Baptism Invalid* : which is this ; “ By a Lay-Administration, I mean, that which is perform'd by one, who never was Commission'd or Impower'd for that Act, by those whom God has appointed to be the Conveyers of his Authority and Commission to Men for that purpose.” For certainly Baptism by such Persons as these, is *Lay-Baptism* ; and because never Commission'd, therefore *Unauthoriz'd Baptism*. Indeed, if there can be any such thing as the giving of a *Real Authority* to Laymen to Baptize, then, when Authoriz'd, they'll cease in that Respect to be Laymen, having [if they can have] a *Sacerdotal Power* to Baptize in Want of the Clergy ; which will make such their Baptism to be *Sacerdotal, Authoriz'd Baptism*, and so not properly *Lay-Baptism*. But that Laymen can have this Power conferr'd on them, it wants still to be prov'd.

He Demands at the Bottom of his 149th Page, “ How can it be said with Truth, that no Council can be produced for the Validity of *Lay-Baptism*, or *Unauthoriz'd Baptism*, when He himself, [that is, the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*] owns that the Council of *Eliberis* Authorized the One, and so many Councils confirm'd the Validity of the Other.” He takes Occasion to put this Question ; and thus to misrepresent me from my Words, in Page 26 of my *Preliminary Discourse to Lay-Baptism Invalid*, Edit. 3^d. where speaking of *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, and the Determinations of some Councils, &c. about them, I conclude the Para-

graph in these Words; namely, "I have no need to dwell upon this, because my Province is only confin'd to Lay, i. e. [that is] Unauthoriz'd Baptism, such as is perform'd by Persons, who never were authoriz'd for that purpose; who act in Direct Opposition to that Order of Men, who are impower'd by Christ to authorize others to Baptize — And the Adversary can bring forth in their behalf not one Council, either General or Provincial, till the Corrupt Ones of the Church of Rome." And all this I do still insist upon, and affirm in answer to his Question, that the Council of Eliberis is not for "Lay, that is, Unauthoriz'd Baptism, such as is perform'd by Persons who never were authoriz'd for that purpose, who act in Direct Opposition to that Order of Men, [i. e. Bishops] who are impower'd by Christ to Authorize others to Baptize.

This is the Connection of my Words; and I will not depart from them, but challenge Mr. Bingham and all his Friends to prove, that the Council of Eliberis's Canon, made with Design to Authorize and Impower some of their own Laicks to Baptize, was a giving Countenance to the Baptisms above-mention'd, which I am disputing against. But of this see more in Page 58, &c. of the following Treatise, that I may not be further Guilty of Repetition; whereby the Reader will easily see, that our Lay-Baptisms are not favour'd by that Council; and in Page 193, &c. that the Ancient Churches who allow'd of the Validity of some Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not esteem those Baptisms to have been destitute of Commission, or Unauthoriz'd, that is, never Authoriz'd; for they esteemed the Clerical Orders of the Baptizers to have been Valid.

Mr. Bingham's 150th Page about Tertullian is answer'd in Page 39, &c. of this Treatise, to which I add,
that

that 'tis very strange, he should charge me with a Mistake for saying, That Tertullian refers us to "the Law and Practice" of the Church, by his saying "concerning Hereticks, we have a Rule to Rebaptize them", when Mr. Bingham himself cannot deny but acknowledges, pag. 150, 151. that Tertullian makes the then Rebaptization of Hereticks to have been the Practice of the Church in Tertullian's Days, and that this was founded upon a Rule: For says our Historian, "I own he speaks of the Practice of Rebaptizing Hereticks as Heathens: But the Rule by which he justifies this Practice is not the Rule of the Church, but the Rule of Christ," pag. 150. And he calls this, of Rebaptization, "The Practice of the Church," in Page 151. Mr. Bingham would insinuate to his Reader, that I make what Tertullian calls a Rule for this Practice to be "the Law and Rule of the Church, distinct from the Law of Christ". But our Reverend Historian should have produc'd something, if he was able, from my own Words, to have proved this, which he cannot do; and therefore herein he acts very much beneath himself: I speak of "the Law and Practice of the Church", without concerning my self whether she made "a Law and Rule distinct from the Law of Christ" or no, and without once specifying what sort of Rule it was whereon she founded her Practice: If she founded it upon the Law of Christ and the Apostles, as Mr. Bingham words it, p. 150. why then she took this Law for her Rule, and so 'twas her Law too; so that even according to Mr. Bingham himself, it was the Law and Practice of the Church: It was "her Law", because she made it the Rule of her Practice; and it was "her Law and Practice", because she bound those who would be admitted to her Communion, to be subject to it. And Mr. Bingham cavils at my calling it "her Law" and

"and Practice", as related by Tertullian, when his own Account of Tertullian's Words makes it to be so too.

His Note concerning St. Ignatius, pag. 152. is sufficiently answer'd in the following Page 25. —

And all that follows of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms in Page 192, of this Book.

And as for the Conclusion of his Appendix, with a Latin Sentence, that he may see I have translated it, and made the Application as he [it seems] desires me to do; I hereby assure him, that if the Person who Baptiz'd me was Episcopally ordain'd [as he certainly was] and if he had been a Heretick, and publickly censur'd as such [which he never was] nay though he had never given publick Notice to the World, that he had repented of and forsaken his Heresy, and so I might have been tempted to believe, that he was therefore a Heretick, at the very Time that he gave me Baptism; [All which, God be praised, I am fully satisfied is no ways applicable to that Reverend Priest who baptiz'd me; yet,] If all this had been justly chargable on him, I should not in the least [considering the Now Laws of the Catholick Church, and of the Church of England in particular] have suspected the Validity of Baptism, given me by such a one, with Water in the Name of the Trinity; but should have reckon'd my self an Incorporated Member of Christ's Church, &c.

But to conclude my long Preface, I leave this with our Reverend Historian, [as he is a Clergyman] and do affirm, that 'tis a Proposition very easy to be proved against any Man whatsoever, That if Baptism perform'd by Persons who were Never really and truly Commision'd by Bishops to Baptize, and who act herein, Rebeliously against, and in Opposition to, the Divine Right of Episcopacy, be Good and Valid Baptism; Then, Authoritative Preaching, Administring the other Sa-

crament, the Power of Excommunicating, of Binding and Loosing, of Retaining and Absolving Men's Sins, and all the Spiritual Functions of the Clergy, are also Good and Valid, when attempted by Unauthoriz'd, never Commission'd Lay-Persons: The Consequence of which, is, the utter Dissolution and taking away of the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, therefore of Christ's Authority here on Earth, and so of all Reveal'd Religion too; which is a Dreadful Consideration; and much more so, if any who ought to be the Guardians of these Sacred Things, should endeavour by their Writings and Preaching, to establish the dangerous Premisses, from whence such prophane Consequences do naturally flow.

London, May 29th,

1713.

THE

24



CONTENTS.

THE Occasion and Nature of the present Dispute	1
CHAP. I.	
MR. Bingham's Account of the Apostolic Commission to Baptize, of the Conveyance and constant Necessity thereof to the End of the World	2
He makes the Commission to Baptize, Essential to the Ministration of Baptism	5
The Pleas of Mr. Bingham's Opinion, that the Apostles at first commissioned all Christians both to Teach and Baptize, refused	7
Mr. Bingham, from this Author, infers, that no one can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives some way or other a Commission from the Apostles	8
And that the Original Power of Baptizing was lodg'd solely and exclusively in Bishops, and derivatively convey'd from them to others; infer'd by him from the Ancient Writers	11
His Notion of Bishops Baptizing Irregular Baptisms, by adding what was wanting in the Circumstances of Baptism, by an irregular Commission, consider'd and set to Rights	12



THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Occasion and Nature of the present Dispute, Page
1

CHAP. II.

MR. *Bingham's* Account of the Apostolick Commission to Baptize, of the Conveyance and constant Necessity thereof to the End of the World, 5
 He makes the Commission to Baptize, Essential to the Ministration of Baptism, 5
 The Pseudo-St. *Ambrose's* Opinion, that the Apostles at first commission'd all Christians both to Teach and Baptize, refuted, 7
 Mr. *Bingham*, from this Author, infers, that *no* one *can* have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives some way or other a Commission from the Apostles, 8
 And that the Original Power of Baptizing was lodg'd *solely and entirely* in Bishops, and derivatively convey'd from them to others; inferr'd by him from the Ancient Writers, II
 His Notion of Bishops Ratifying Irregular Baptisms, by adding what was wanting in the Circumstances of Baptism, by an *ar-*
ter Confirmation, consider'd and set to Rights, ibid.
His

The CONTENTS.

His Distinction between <i>Irregularity</i> and <i>Invalidity</i> , consider'd,	13
His Notion of Baptism minister'd <i>without a Commission</i> , that it was esteem'd <i>Valid</i> , notwithstanding the <i>Sinfulness</i> of the ACT OF MINISTRATION, refuted,	13, 14, &c.
His Attempt to prove, that the Ancients did not suppose Baptism to be wholly founded upon <i>Sacerdotal Powers</i> , prov'd to be contrary to, and inconsistent with his own Assertions,	16, to 18
His Fancy, that Baptism by an <i>Irregular Priest</i> , if allow'd to be <i>Valid</i> upon the Account of his Priestly Character, must be <i>Authoriz'd</i> and <i>Unauthoriz'd</i> , <i>Regular</i> and <i>Irregular</i> , <i>Lawful</i> and <i>Unlawful</i> at the same time, and in the very same <i>Act</i> and <i>Respect</i> , and therefore a Contradiction; prov'd to be very fallacious,	19
His ill-grounded Guesses, at the Reasons why the Ancients allow'd of the <i>Validity</i> of Baptism by an <i>Irregular Priest</i> ,	22
His odd Notion of <i>Deacons</i> not being <i>Priests</i> , and consequently that Baptism perform'd by them in Absence of the <i>Priests</i> , is not Baptism by a <i>Sacerdotal</i> or <i>Priestly Power</i> ; refuted,	16, 25
C H A P. III.	
Testimonies for and against Lay-Baptism Examined,	30
Mr. Bingham owns that <i>Lay-Men</i> were <i>always</i> debarr'd from the Ministration of Baptism in ALL ORDINARY CASES,	ibid.
This prov'd to be a Nulling of all <i>Lay-Baptisms</i> perform'd in Ordinary Cases; consequently that our Dissenters Baptisms are Null and Void,	ibid.
Mr. Bingham states the <i>grand Question</i> wrong, concerning <i>Lay-Baptism in Extraordinary Cases</i> , if he would bring it to our Case about which we are disputing,	32
The Grand Question of our Lay-Baptisms truly stated,	ibid.
No Testimonies for Lay-Baptism in the first 200 Years of Christianity,	33
Therefore no ancient Catholick Tradition, no general Sense and Practice of the Church, can be found whereon to establish the Practice of Lay-Baptism,	ibid.
Mr. Bingham owns that Particular Churches, are Exceptions against his pretended general Practice of the Church in this Matter,	32, 33
Mr. Bingham's whole Evidence amounts to no <i>Catholick Tradition</i> for Lay-Baptism,	34
St. Ignatius, Anno 71, makes Baptism to be Null and Void, when perform'd by one who was never commission'd by the Bishop,	35

The CONTENTS.

St. <i>Hermas</i> mentions none but Episcopally or Divinely Authoriz'd Baptizers, for Cases of Extremity,	38
<i>Tertullian's</i> private Notion, about the Year 200, of Lay-Men's Right to baptize in Absence of the Clergy ; no Evidence of any Law, Tradition or Custom of the Catholick Church, for their pretended Right,	39, &c.
His false Reason upon which he founds their pretended Right, refuted,	43
His other particular Fancies, may with as much Reason be call'd the Church's General Sense and Practice, as his Notion of Lay-Baptism may,	44
He gives us not one Instance of any such Baptism, allow'd of by the Church in his Days,	47
His Words are full and direct against our ordinary Lay-Baptisms, and by Consequence prove their Nullity,	ibid.
St. <i>Cyprian</i> and <i>Firmilian</i> about the Year 256. reckon'd Lay-Baptisms to be Null and Void, as St. <i>Basil</i> witnesses,	48
St. <i>Cyprian's</i> own Works plainly shew, that he esteem'd all Baptisms to be void, that were perform'd by such as were reckon'd to be destitute of Priestly Power and Authority,	51
<i>Firmilian's</i> Letter to St. <i>Cyprian</i> proves, that <i>Firmilian</i> and the Council of <i>Iconium</i> held the same,	54, 55
Several of St. <i>Cyprian's</i> Collegues in the Council of <i>Carthage</i> , the same,	55, 56
The 47th Canon call'd Apostolical, the same,	57
The Council of <i>Eliberis</i> in Spain held by 19 Bishops Anno 305, does not favour Baptism by Persons, who never were commission'd by Bishops to baptize,	58, III
This Council is against <i>Tertullian's</i> private Opinion, of Lay-Men's Right in themselves to baptize in Absence of the Clergy,	59
And 'tis also against Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Guess that <i>the Ancients might esteem Baptism by whomsoever Christian perform'd to be good and valid,</i>	59, 60
The Council of <i>Eliberis's</i> Canon, is no Argument for the Practice of the Catholick Church,	61
The Fable of <i>Athanasius</i> , when as Boy, baptizing his Play-fellows in Sport ; and of <i>Alexander</i> the Bishop's determining the Baptism to be Valid, expos'd,	62
<i>Rufinus</i> , the first Author of it, a very credulous and careless Historian,	65
<i>Sozomen's</i> Account of it taken only from <i>Rufinus</i> ,	67
He was no very judicious Writer,	68
<i>Socrates Scholasticus</i> , the most Judicious and Diligent of the three Historians,	69
This latter, though quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> to vouch for the Truth of that Fable, does not speak one Word, either of the Boy	
<i>Atha-</i>	

The CONTENTS.

<i>Athanasius's</i> Baptizing the other Boys ; or of <i>Alexander's</i> sup- pos'd Determination about it,	69, 70
He says he Copy'd from <i>Rufinus</i> , such Passages, in the relation whereof <i>Rufinus</i> did not forsake the Truth,	71
And therefore his omitting this Fable, is an Argument that he did not believe <i>Rufinus's</i> Relation of it,	ibid.
Another of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Authors for the Truth of this Fable, founds it upon a new Supposition of his own, that spoils the Design of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> relating it,	72
<i>Johannes Moschus</i> , another of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Vouchers, a Ridicu- lous Visionary Monk of the 7th Century ; who writes this Fa- ble, among other idle Legendary Stories of Miracles, Dreams, &c. not to be credited ; some Particulars whereof are in- stanc'd,	73
<i>Nicephorus Calistus</i> , another of his Vouchers, a Fabulous Writer of the 14th Century, tho' Mr. <i>Bingham</i> says he relates this Story, yet in truth he do's not relate it,	75
And if he had, would have been but a sorry Evidence,	ibid.
A just Reflection on Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> producing such Fabulous Writers, to vouch for the Truth of this Fable, so pernicious in its Consequences, if believ'd to be true, just and right,	ibid.
The little or no Credit this Story has among Learned Men,	76
Even Papists themselves reject it,	77
This a Reproach to some Protestants who believe it,	78
But Protestants too have given their Testimony against it,	79
The Circumstances of the Story it self spoil its Credit,	ibid.
The Authors who believ'd this Story, are no Evidences that it was agreeable to the General Sense and Practice of the Church,	84
Mr. <i>Bingham</i> owns, there was Neither Canon nor Precedent PER- HAPS to Warrant the suppos'd Fact of <i>Athanasius</i> ; and that it would be STRANGE, if any such Canon should be made in the Church,	90
His believing that " 'tis no easy Matter to produce an Ancient Canon " DIRECTLY TO CONFRONT <i>Alexander's</i> suppos'd Determi- " nation, is nothing to the purpose,	91
Because the Institution of Baptism and Laws of the Church, do confine Baptism to a Commission, and consequently forbid such a Determination in favour of its Validity when without a Com- mission,	ibid.
Mr. <i>Bingham</i> supposes, but do's not prove, and therefore is call'd upon to prove it, that an Uninstituted Ministration of Baptism, may be made Valid by a Post-fact Confirmation of the Bishop,	93
If	

The CONTENTS.

If the Fable of <i>Athanasius</i> had been true, yet nothing to the Purpose could have been inferr'd from it,	95
Nor any thing have been safely concluded from it,	ibid.
The Dreadful Consequences of admitting Bishop <i>Alexander's</i> sup- posed Opinion, to have been JUST and RIGHT,	ibid.
Which Proves the whole Story to be Foolish and Ridiculous; and therefore contrary to the General Sense and Practice of the Ca- tholick Church,	97
<i>Hilary</i> , Deacon of Rome, about Anno 350, affirms, that in his time Laymen did not Baptize,	ibid.
<i>Pacianus</i> , Bishop of Barcelona, Nulls Baptism by Persons not ha- ving a Priestly Power,	98
<i>Optatus</i> , Bishop of Milevis's SUPPOS'D NOTION of the Validity of Baptism by any Person whatsoever, prov'd to be Singular and Popish, and not Countenanc'd by the Catholick Church,	104
His Words more Justly and Candidly interpreted, infer no such <i>Latitudinarian</i> Principle,	106
<i>St. Basil</i> , Bishop of <i>Cæsarea</i> , Anno 369, Nulls Lay-Baptism,	109
<i>St. Chrysostom</i> , Archbishop of Constantinople, Anno 398, do's the same,	114
A Passage quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> out of the Apostolick Consti- tutions, do's so likewise,	117
<i>St. Jerom</i> in the Latter end of the IVth Century, his Notion of Laymen's Power to Baptize in Case of Necessity, founded on No Law of God, or of the Ancient Catholick Church,	120
But on a False Principle of his own, much the same with that of <i>Tertullian</i> ,	122
He Contradicts this Notion by his Dialogue against the <i>Luciferian</i> Schismatics, wherein he Confutes the <i>Luciferians</i> by this Prin- ciple, That if the <i>Arian</i> Clergy were but Laicks, the Baptism administer'd by them ought to be rejected,	123, to 138
The Inconsistency of <i>St. Jerom's</i> first Notion, with the Scope of this Dialogue,	131, 139
He Nulls Lay-Baptism by saying, "That without Priests there is no Church,	139
Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Cavil at Dr. <i>Forbes's</i> and Mr. <i>Reeves's</i> Words, upon this Dialogue, consider'd,	140
<i>St. Augustin</i> , as quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> from <i>Gratian</i> , misrep- resented by him to the English Reader, in favour of Lay-Bap- tism,	143
His Words prove No Matter of Fact, of Laymen's Baptizing,	ibid
Another Passage of that Father, as quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> from <i>Gratian</i> , makes the Apostolick Commission to be a Necessary Con- dition of Baptism,	145

The CONTENTS.

Another Passage <i>Gratian</i> attributes to <i>St. Augustin</i> , which by Necessary Consequence Nulls our Lay-Baptisms,	146
A Story <i>Gratian</i> relates as from <i>St. Augustin</i> in favour of Lay-Baptism,	ibid.
<i>St. Augustin</i> , if he did relate it, owns that 'twas only a Report, and the Author unknown,	147
<i>St. Augustin's</i> suppos'd Opinion, That such a Case, as a Layman's Baptizing a Person in Danger of Death, where no other was present, might happen ; and that a Person so in Danger ought not to be left unbaptiz'd, fairly consider'd,	147, 148
<i>St. Augustin's</i> Genuin Works, prove Nothing of any Law, Tradition, or Custom of the Catholick Church for Lay-Baptism,	150, to 162
He Hesitates, and is not positive, that Lay-Baptism in Case of Necessity is Valid ; this proves, that he did not know of any Catholick Tradition for the pretended Validity thereof,	150, 151
Which is further Confirm'd, by his not being able to Clear such pretended Baptisms from the Guilt of Sin,	153
His Notion of Usurped Lay-Baptism in Ordinary Cases, being Unlawful, and to be repented of by both Giver and Receiver, and that 'tis yet <i>Valid</i> ; refuted at large,	154, to 160
He acknowledges this not to have been the Determination of any General Council, but his own Private Opinion,	155, 156
He was not wholly free from introducing Novelties in Religion,	161
<i>Gelasius</i> , Bishop of Rome, Anno 492. His Saying of Laymen's having Power granted them to Baptize in Cases of Extreme Necessity, is no Proof that this was the General Sense and Practice of the Church,	162, 163
Mr. Bingham's false Inference from <i>Gelasius's</i> Words, That LAYMEN had as much Power to Baptize in Absence of Deacons, as DEACONS HAD in Absence of the Presbyters and Bishop, expos'd,	162
<i>Gelasius</i> is no Evidence for the Validity of Baptism by Persons who were never Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize,	164
<i>Isidore</i> , Bishop of Sevil, Anno 595, founds the Power of Baptizing upon the Commission Christ gave to his Apostles,	165, 166
His saying of Laymen's being permitted or impower'd to Baptize, is still confining the Power of Baptizing to a Commission to be first receiv'd by the Baptizer,	167
The Unaccountable Lengths some Men ran into, concerning the Minister of Baptism, after <i>St. Augustin's</i> Days,	ibid.

The CONTENTS.

The Summ of Mr. Bingham's whole Evidence, in his own Words, is, That the General Sense and Practice of the Church for the first 600 Years, was grounded upon the Apostolick Commission, given to all Baptizers in *Cases Ordinary* and *Extraordinary* 169

From whence it follows, that the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church, do's not Countenance the pretended Validity of Baptisms, perform'd by Persons, who never were Commission'd by Bishops, 170

Mr. Bingham's whole Evidence is not so much as a Proof, that the Ancient Catholick Church for the first 600 Years, did ever Authorize or Commission Laymen to Baptize, in want of the Clergy, *ibid.*

CHAP. IV.
Mr. Bingham's Objections against the Testimonies of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, answer'd, 174

CHAP. V.
HIS Acknowledgments, concerning the Great Question now in Dispute, viz. "Whether the Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Laymen, was allow'd [by the Ancient Catholick Church] to be Valid? Wherein he establishes our Assertion, 189

CHAP. VI.
THE Ancient Churches, who allow'd of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not reckon those Baptisms to have been Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, Anti Episcopal Lay-Baptisms, tho' Mr. Bingham endeavours to make them look as such, 193
Of the Rite of Imposition of Hands, whereby repenting Heretics and Schismatics were receiv'd into the Church, 208

CHAP. VII.
Mr Bingham's Account of the supposed Practice of Lay-Baptism by the Modern Greeks, Moscovites, and Foreign Reform'd, examin'd, 201

The CONTENTS.

Of the Modern Greeks,	ibid.
Of the Moscovites,	240
Of the Foreign Reform'd,	246

C H A P. VIII.

THE whole Evidence of Antiquity summ'd up; proving,
That the Far Greater Majority of Ancient Testimony, is a-
gainst all Pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons, who ne-
ver were Authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize; and consequently,
that such Baptisms are not Valid by any Ecclesiastical Law,
Tradition, or Custom of the Ancient Catholick Church,
259, to 269

The Conclusion, containing a True State of the Question about
Supposed Cases of Necessity, where Episcopally Authoriz'd Bap-
tizers are not to be had, 269

E R R A T A.

- P**age 3. Line 29. *for* Baptism, *read* Christian Sacraments.
P. 36. l. the last, *for*, by Virtue any, *read*, by Virtue of any.
P. 59. l. 15. *read* Scholastical History.
P. 117. l. 19. *for*, this of the Invalidity, *read*, this Applicable to
the Invalidity.
P. 126. In the Note l. 4. *read*, est enim.
P. 127. l. 2. *read*, do not act. L. 13. *read*, whom you do not.
L. 15, 16, 22. blot out "the Double Comma's."
P. 144. l. 22. *read* Fallacy.
P. 224. l. 21. *read* His Collection.
P. 269. l. 5. *read*, I have said.
P. 272. l. 10. *read*, and Deacons.



THE
SECOND PART
OF
Lay-Baptism Invalid.

CHAP. I.

*The Occasion and Nature of the
present Dispute.*

§ I.  H A T there may be no Mistake in the Nature and Design of this Controversy, the Reader is desir'd to bear this always in mind, and to keep his Eye continually upon it; That the Occasion thereof is a most Novel, and formerly unheard of, Unchristian Usurpation, attempted at the Reformation, and since that time to this day, by Men who never receiv'd any Divine Commission; and who yet, in Opposition to, and Rebellion against, their Spiritual Sovereigns, refusing to receive any such

Commission from them, endeavour to advance themselves into the High-Priests and Priests Office, and to minister in such Holy Things, as God has appropriated to that *Sacred Commission*, which he gives to Men for that Purpose: And this they do, not upon the pretence of *Necessity*, arising, as some suppose, from the want of such as are Commission'd, but in an *obstinate perverse Resistance* against Christ's *Spiritual Vicegerents*, undervaluing and trampling upon *that Authority* wherewith He has invested them.

§ II. It is also to be remembred, That God always us'd (if we may believe the Divine Oracles) to set a Mark of his severest Displeasure, *not only* upon such *Usurping Administrators* themselves, but also upon those who adher'd to and encourag'd them in their Usurpations; as I have formerly observ'd and instanc'd upon this Occasion; and He has made such Usurpers and their Adherents sensible of his Wrath and Fury, not only when they have attempted Sacred Ministrations, without any plea of Necessity, as did *Corah* and his Company, and King *Uzziah*; but also, when, to all appearance, they had a fair plea of Necessity to excuse their Usurpations, if *That* could be an Excuse, as we see that it was not in the Cases of *Saul* and *Uzza*.

§ III. Hence it behoves such Usurpers, and those who concurr with, abett, and encourage their Usurpations, seriously to consider what they are doing; and upon what foundation they can venture to affirm any Validity to be in such *pretended Ministrations*; when God himself has branded *others like theirs*, with indelible Marks of Infamy and

and Reproach, by the Everlasting Sacred History of his Just Indignation and most Righteous Vengeance against such Usurpers, and their Encouragers and Abettors.

§ IV. It was this Consideration, that at first set the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, upon enquiring, whether God has a kinder Regard for such Usurpations now, than He had formerly; and whether He will now admit of and receive as good and valid, the *pretended* Ministration of Christian Sacraments, from such Usurpers Hands, as He *never did* so much as once Authorize, Commission, or Impower for Sacred Ministrations, since He has Ordain'd and Set apart a particular Order of Men, whom He Vested with his own Authority for such Purposes? Upon a serious Enquiry into this Matter, and a deliberate Search into the *Divine Institution* of the Christian Priesthood and Sacraments, and the Nature thereof, He could not chuse but think thus much; That the *Commission* of him who ministers Christian Sacraments, is as much, as durable, and as constantly an obliging Positive Divine Institution, as either the *Matter* or *Form* of the Sacraments is; and that consequently, a Ministration *destitute* of either of these latter, which is so displeasing to God, as to be therefore wholly *Null and Void*; is, but an *Equal* Offence against the Institution of Baptism, with another false Ministration which is destitute only of the *Divine Commission*; and that therefore this latter, where there is no *Commission*, is as much *Offensive* to the Divine Majesty, and consequently *Null and Void*, as the other, upon the very same Reason and Foundation: And this, with respect to *Baptism*, he has endeavour'd to prove, from the *Institution it self of Baptism*, keep-

ing close to the Rule which our Saviour set his Church herein. And the Opposers of this, must produce no less than *Vincentius Lirinensis's* Golden Rule, viz. *Traditio, semper, ubique, & ab omnibus credita*, to prove that it was a Catholick Tradition, always, in every Place, and by all taught, believ'd, and practis'd, at least by the generality of the Ancient Church, viz. That the Institution of *Baptism* does not hinder, but that Persons who *were never Commission'd at all to Baptize*, may administer *Legally Valid Baptism*; I say, Legally Valid, with respect to the *Divine Law*; for if it wants of that Legal Validity, what signifies any other pretended Validities of Mens Invention? If they do not produce such an Universal Tradition as this, for the Interpretation of the Institution of Baptism, in favour of Ministrations perform'd by such as were *never Commission'd*; their pompous Show of *Quotations* from some few *Latin Fathers*, will amount to no more than a bare Discovery of some of their private Opinions; which, in Matters of such vast Moment as this is, will fall *infinitely* short of Deciding the *Merits* of the Cause.

§ V. Let us then see what Mr. *Bingham* has done towards the Discovery of this Universal Tradition; and whether his Scholastical History does not rather prove, that the Universality of the Church's Tradition, is, That the Instituition of Baptism requires the *Divine Commission* of the Minister of Baptism constantly to accompany the Ministration thereof; and because *constantly*, therefore, that the Commission is *Essential* to the *Valid Ministration* thereof; *Essential*, by reason of its Equal Obligation and Necessity with the *Matter* and the *Form* by the Institution.

C H A P. II.

Our Historian's Account of the Apostolick Commission to Baptize ; of the Conveyance, and constant Necessity thereof to the End of the World.

§ I. **H**E first very rightly begins with the Commission given to the *Apostles*, p. 2. where he says, “ It is certain, the Commission to Baptize, was Originally given by our Saviour to the Eleven Apostles ; for so it is expressly said, Mat. xxviii. 16, &c. Then he adds ; That “ By the Tenor of this Commission, it is certain they were invested with Authority, not only to Baptize themselves, but to communicate this Power to others : For the Commission and Power of Baptizing, was not to Die with them, but to Continue to the End of the World, p. 3. Upon which 'tis very remarkable, that He makes the Commission to Baptize of constant Duration and Obligation, in and to the Church ; for he says, 'twas to Continue to the End of the World : And the very great and pressing Necessity of this, he urges thus ; “ But then two Questions arise from hence : Whom they actually Authoriz'd to Baptize ? And to whom they gave Commission to Authorize others to Baptize ? For (says he) both these things were Necessary, to Preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, at least in Future Ages, p. 3. Pray observe this, for 'tis a granting of the Thing disputed for,

viz. That the Church cannot be preserv'd, Christian Baptism cannot be had, *without the Commission to Baptize* ; for, if it can, then, *whom the Apostles actually Authoriz'd, and to whom they gave Commission to Authorize others, to Baptize,* were not Necessary to preserve the Church : For where lies the Necessity, if it can be preserv'd without the Commission to Baptize ? But this Historian says they were Necessary ; *i. e.* the Commission, who should Baptize, was Necessary to preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, in future Ages. And this amounts to no less, than that the Commission to Baptize was Necessary to Preserve Baptism ; because if Baptism is not Preserv'd, the Church itself is not preserv'd, since Baptism is the Incorporation of all its Members ; and therefore, where there is No Commission, there is no Baptism, no Church, according to the Order of Christ ; if we may believe Mr. Bingham himself. This is a fair setting out for him at the Beginning of his Work, and is destructive of the main Design of his History, and shews that *the Divine has the better of the Historian.*

§ II. He next proceeds to Answer the Two Questions he just now propos'd, and proves, first, That the Apostles gave Commission to Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons to Baptize ; — and then says, “ *but still it remains a Question, whether they extend-*
 “ *ed this Commission to any others, either in Ordinary or Extraordinary Cases,* p. 3. He says,
 “ *The Ancient Author, under the Name of St. Ambrose, was of Opinion, That the Apostles first found*
 “ *it necessary, for the Augmentation and Encrease*
 “ *of the Church, to Grant a General Commission to*
 “ *all Christians, both to Teach and Baptize ; but*
 “ *as*

“ as soon as that Necessity was over, as soon as
 “ the World was generally Converted, and Churches
 “ erected, Governors and other Officers were appointed
 “ in all Churches, and then this General Commission
 “ was withdrawn ; so that none, even among the
 “ Clergy, was to presume to meddle with any Office
 “ to which he was not Appointed. Mr. Bingham
 goes on with his Quotation, thus ; “ Hence it came
 “ to pass, that neither Deacons were allow’d to
 “ Preach, nor the Inferior Clergy nor Lay-men to
 “ Baptize, p. 3 & 4. But the Latin, as himself
 quotes it in the Margin, p. 3. is, “ *Hinc ergo est,*
 “ *unde nunc neque Diaconi in populo Prædicant, neque*
 “ *Clerici vel Laici Baptizant.* † All in the Pre-
 sent Tense ; which is a Proof that the supposititious
 St. Ambrose said, concerning the Time that he lived
 in, *Hence it comes to pass, that Now* neither Dea-
 cons are allowed to Preach, nor the Inferior Clergy
 nor Lay-men to Baptize : plainly excluding all Lay-
 men of his time and knowledge, without exception,
 from that Power ; and whoever was the Author,
 whether Hilary the Deacon of Rome, or Remigius of
 Lyons, he cannot be suppos’d to have written ear-
 lier than the middle of the Fourth Century.

But now, Is the Opinion of this spurious St. Am-
 brose, That the Apostles did at first “ Grant a
 “ General Commission to all Christians both
 “ to Teach and Baptize,” true or no ? If it were
 true, would all the Greek and Latin Writers, for
 350 Years together, have been silent about this
 Matter ? And if they had said any thing to con-
 firm it, would our Reverend Historian have omitted
 their more primitive Evidence, and instead of it,

† Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948.

have given us only one Quotation from a doubted Author, whose *Ability* and *Veracity* both are very justly suspicious, upon the account of his *Obscurity*, his *great Distance* from the Days of the Apostles, and his Singularity of Opinion about this Matter, for which he vouches no former Author? If it were true, would the Apostle St. Paul have given us reason to believe the contrary, by affirming, in his Days, when the World was not Generally Converted, An. Chr. 59. That God — set some in his Church, first Apostles, secondarily Propbets, thirdly Teachers; upon which he makes this Interrogation — Are all Teachers? 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29. which is a strong Affirmation, that all Christians were not then Teachers; contrary to the Opinion of the spurious St. Ambrose, that the Apostles did at first grant a general Commission to all Christians to Teach; and since he is wrong in this, 'tis reasonable to believe he is so in the other, viz. the general Commission to all Christians to Baptize, which he connects to that of their Teaching: And therefore our Historian has prov'd nothing of Lay-Christians being at first Authoriz'd to Baptize, from this Quotation: since his Author's pretended Evidence is contrary to Scripture, in one Instance; and not establish'd thereby, but wholly singular with respect to all Antiquity before him, in the other.

§ III. After this Quotation; Mr. Bingham says, concerning the Power of Baptizing receiv'd from the Apostles, by way of Paraphrase upon his Author's Words, "That his Author seems to have been of Opinion, that — as no one can have a Power of Baptizing, but He that receives, some way or other, a Commission from them, [i. e. the

the Apostles;] So, &c. p. 4. This is our Historian's own Comment; and I desire it may be taken the more notice of, because I shall make some further Use of it hereafter; in the mean time, it plainly intimates, in conjunction with this Quotation, That the Commission to Baptize **can only be executed** by the Apostles and their Successors, and such as are *Appointed, Authoriz'd, Impower'd* or *Commission'd* by them, be they who they will, whether Men in standing Holy Orders, or, in want of such, others who are not so, *if they can be at all Commission'd*: And whether they can or no, I trouble not my self; but leave that to be disputed between Mr. Bingham and his Antagonist the Doctor at Greenwich, Author of a little Pamphlet, Intituled, *New Dangers to the Christian Priesthood*, (who reckons the standing Priesthood to be in very great Danger, upon this Principle, of Bishops having Power to Authorize Lay-men to Baptize) which has been Answer'd in the *Preface* to the Third Edition of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*.

§ IV. Mr. Bingham proceeds with his Author's Opinion; "*When the Necessities of the Church requir'd it, they [i. e. the Apostles] had Power to Authorize others, besides the standing Ministers, to Baptize; which Power they both might and did recall again, as soon as those Necessities of the Church were over: And upon this Principle it was, chiefly, that the Ancient Bishops of the Church allow'd Deacons and sometimes Lay-men to Baptize,* &c. p. 4. But our Historian's Author has not prov'd the Truth of his Opinion. He has given no Ancient Testimony of the "*Apostle's Commissioning others besides the standing Ministers to Baptize*": This pretended Matter of Fact is so far from being well

well attested, that it is not attested at all; we have nothing but his bare *ipse dixit* for it, at 300 Years Distance from the Apostles, and have reason to believe it to be false: See § II. And therefore to found the Principle of Bishops Power to Authorize Lay-men to Baptize, upon this not prov'd but pretended Matter of Fact only, is very weak and precarious. Besides, why are *Deacons* here rank'd with Lay-men, among those who are not *standing Ministers to Baptize*? Did not Mr. Bingham reckon 'em before as *standing Ministers*? p. 3. How shall we account for these things? But further, If it could be prov'd, as it has not yet been, that Bishops have Power, and by *virtue thereof* have sometimes allow'd or authoriz'd Lay-men to Baptize, "*when the Necessities of the Church requir'd it*;" Is it not a jest to talk at this rate, if Lay-men can in such Cases "*have a Power of Baptizing*" without the Bishop's *Commission*? Either such Exigencies alone gave them a Power, or they did not. If they did, then they stood in no need of being *Authoriz'd by Bishops*; and so Bishops taking upon them so to *Authorize them*, was a pretence of Power which signify'd nothing: If such Exigencies alone did not Impower them to Baptize, then, if they had pretended to Baptize, having never receiv'd the Bishop's *Commission*, they would have exerted *no Power of Baptizing*, and so their Act would have been *No Baptism*: It remains then, that the whole Power of *Legally Valid Baptism* must be resolv'd into the *Commission* of the Baptizer, in conjunction with the Matter and the Form. Otherwise the Power of *Giving and Withdrawing a Commission* to Baptize will be but a Banter. And *without this Principle*, [of the Necessity of the Apostolick Commission to Baptize]

Baptize] it will be impossible to account for the Practise of all the Bishops of the Catholick Church, who appropriate to themselves alone the Power of giving others Commission to Baptize.

§ V. Mr. Bingham tells us next, That many Passages of the Ancient Writers “*Speak of the Original Power of administering Baptism, as lodg’d solely and entirely in the hands of Bishops, as the Apostles immediate Successors, [This is acknowledged] He proceeds, “and derivatively convey’d from them to others,”* — whom they Authoriz’d to be either the standing and Ordinary Ministers of Baptism, or else only the Occasional and Extraordinary Ministers of it, in Times of absolute Necessity, and great Exigences of the Church, — p. 5. This of “*only the Occasional and Extraordinary Ministers of Baptism, besides Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who are the “standing and Ordinary Ministers”* thereof, he has not yet brought Evidence for. Then he goes on, That the Antients “*thought Baptism chiefly to be the Bishop’s Office; and when it was done by others, it was still done by his Authority, and reputed as his Act; which he also Ratified as Occasion required, by adding what was wanting in the Circumstances of the Solemnity, in a subsequent Confirmation,* p. 8. This is very Right, they did think so, and the Bishop did so Ratifie and Confirm what was wanting in the Circumstances of the Solemnity, but never what was wanting of the Essentials relating to the Sacrament, “*in a subsequent Confirmation.*” Let our Historian produce any ancient Instances of these latter sort of pretended Confirmations, if he is able; which he has not yet done. And the Commission to Baptize,

Baptize, is not a Circumstantial, but an *Essential* relation to Baptism.

§ VI. He says, That this Point was clear among
 “ them *beyond all Dispute*, That Presbyters had only
 “ a *Derivative and Subordinate Power to Baptize as*
 “ *well as others, and so long as they kept to this*
 “ *Rule, their Baptisms were Regular and Lawful, as*
 “ *done in Conformity to the Establish’d Rules and*
 “ *Orders of the Church : But if they set themselves*
 “ *in Opposition to their Bishop, and either acted with-*
 “ *out or against his Consent, as Absolute and In-*
 “ *dependent of him, then their Baptisms and all*
 “ *their other Offices were Irregular and Unlawful,*
 “ *because done in a Schismatical Way, and in a pro-*
 “ *fess’d Contempt of Authority, and all the standing*
 “ *Rules and Laws of the Church,* p. 9, 10.

This of Presbyters Derivative and Subordinate Power to Baptize, is not to be deny’d : But then it is to be enquir’d, What Presbyters among the Antients did ever offer to Baptize, as **Absolute and Independent of Bishops** ? Mr. Bingham has not produced any ancient Instance of such modern Rebels ; no, the Schismatics of old adher’d to, and depended upon some Bishop or other. And if it be proper to call their Baptisms Irregular and Unlawful, yet their Irregularity and Unlawfulness had a reference only to the *Circumstantial Rules and Laws of the Church* ; as a Baptism administer’d by a Priest, with us, in a *Private House*, where there is no Necessity for such Private Baptism, may be call’d *Irregular and Unlawful*, because contrary to the Church’s Rubrick ; it may be fairly aggravated to such a pitch, as to be affirm’d to be “ *in Opposition* ”
 “ *to the Bishop, and without or against his Consent.* ”
 And yet all this is but a *Circumstantial Irregularity*,
 which

which is certainly a great Sin, but yet not such a one as that which is an *Essential Irregularity, or breach of the Essential Law or Institution of Baptism.*

This answers what our Author says, “*That a plain Distinction must needs have been made always, between the Irregularity and the Invalidity of any Baptism; since the want of a Lawful Commission and Authority would render the Act of Administration Sinful and Irregular, but not absolutely Invalid,* p. 10. For here he begs the Question, as if want of Commission for some Circumstance relating to Baptism, were exactly the same as want of Commission to Baptize; or as if an Officer Commission’d to Baptize, but restrain’d from Executing his Commission by some Ecclesiastical Law respecting some particular Circumstances, were *but equal* in Authority and Power to Baptize, with One who never receiv’d any Commission or Authority to administer that Sacrament at all: Just as if a Man should say, that the Irregularity of a Lay-Person’s Washing, who never was at all in any respect whatsoever Commission’d to Baptize, is but of the *same Nature* with that Irregularity which a Priest Commission’d to Baptize commits, when he executes his Commission with some sinful Circumstance, contrary to the Injunction or particular Licence of his Bishop for that particular Occasion; thus confounding *Circumstantial* with *Essential* Irregularities: And without making this Necessary Distinction,

§ VII. He next tries, “*How it came to pass, that Baptism ministred by a Presbyter Illegally and without Commission, [as he calls it] was nevertheless esteem’d Valid, notwithstanding the Sinfulness of the Act of Administration?*

But

But in his stating of this Question, he is very uncorrect, nay, unintelligible; he speaks of a **Presbyter without Commission**. Who can understand this? If he is a *Presbyter*, then he *has a Commission*; for 'tis only his having a Commission that makes him a *Presbyter*; and when he has *no Commission*, or is *without a Commission*, which I take to be all one, he is no *Presbyter* at all: So that here Mr. Bingham makes an Enquiry concerning a Person who is a *Presbyter* and *no Presbyter*, who is in Commission, and yet “*without a Commission*”; “and this is enquiring about *nothing at all*. But however, to find his Meaning, if I can: By Baptism, ministred by a *Presbyter*, illegally, and **without Commission**, he may mean, such a Baptism as is ministred by a *Presbyter* who is Commission'd by his Bishop to Baptize; but he does it in such a *Circumstance* for which Circumstance he receiv'd *no Commission*; nay, he does it, probably, in such a Circumstance as is prohibited both by the Laws of God and his Church; and it may be our Historian would enquire, how it came to pass that such Baptisms were nevertheless esteem'd Valid?

There is another thing which wants to be clear'd in his Wording the Question, and that is this; What he means by the **Sinfulness of the Act of Ministration**? For a *Presbyter* or Priest's Act of Baptism, as such, is *not a Sinful Act*, when it has all the Essentials relating to Baptism. The *Act of Ministration* is good in it self; all the Sin is only in the *Circumstance* that attends the Act: So that by “*the Sinfulness of the Act of Ministration*,” I believe our Author here means, the *Sinfulness of that Circumstance* which accompanies the Act of Ministration. With Submission, I think, these things ought to have been more clearly express'd, because
very

very much depends upon that Enquiry which is to be made about them; and I am sorry this learned Gentleman puts me to the Trouble of thus endeavouring to set in a clear Light a Question of so great Importance, which he has *so darkly* propos'd to resolve.

§ VIII. We come now to see how he resolves this Question; and first, he disapproves of doing it, by supposing *an indelible* Character and Power in the Priesthood, which is said by the School-men to be “*given to a Presbyter at his Ordination, by which they think all his ministerial Acts stand good, tho’ done in an irregular Manner against the Laws and Canons of the Church; and that a Priest cannot be divested of this Power after he is once legally Ordained to it.*” Now as to this indelible Character which our Historian argues against, I find no necessity to take either Side of the Question; Whether there is an *absolutely indelible Character and Power* conferr’d on Priests in a valid Ordination, or whether there is not? This will not touch the Truth I am concern’d for, whether they have it, or have it not; only I must make some Observations upon Mr. Bingham’s supposed Reasons, against the Antients allowing the Baptism perform’d by such disorderly Priests to be good and valid upon the Account of their *indelible* Character.

And first he says, That the Antients “*did not suppose Baptism founded wholly upon Sacerdotal Powers, nor tied so absolutely to the Office of a Priest, but that it might in ordinary Cases also be administer’d by Deacons, if they had the Bishop’s Commission; and by Lay-men in extraordinary Cases of pressing Necessity, if they had the Bishop’s License and Authority to do it, as we shall see*”
“*here-*

“ hereafter, says our Author,” p. 10. In giving this his suppos'd Reason, he has committed several Mistakes; for first, his Assertion, that the Antients did not suppose Baptism to be founded wholly upon *Sacerdotal Powers*, is inconsistent with what he had said before, viz. That *“ the Commission and Power [given the Apostles] to Baptize, was to continue to the End of the World; ”* That *“ whom they authoriz'd to Baptize, and to whom they gave Commission to authorize others to Baptize,”* were both of them *“ necessary to preserve the Church according to the Order of Christ in future Ages,”* p. 2. *“ That no one can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives some way or other a Commission from them,”* i. e. the Apostles, p. 4. *“ That the Original Power of administering Baptism,”* — is — *“ lodg'd solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops,”* p. 5. — That *“ when it was done by others, it was still done by his, the Bishop's, Authority, and reputed as his Act,”* p. 8. All which was plainly founding Baptism wholly upon *Sacerdotal Powers*, if the Apostolick Commission, Episcopal Authority, and the Bishop's Act, can be called *Sacerdotal*, and if *no one* can have a *Power of Baptizing* without it. But now, indeed, 'tis otherwise with our Historian, because he likes not the indelible Character of the Priesthood. *“ The Antients did not suppose Baptism wholly founded upon Sacerdotal Powers,”* they did, and they did not; I am sorry for the Occasion of this Remark. 2dly, His here reckoning **Deacons** among such as have not *Sacerdotal Powers*, by making their Baptizing an instance that Baptism was not by the Antients wholly founded upon *Sacerdotal Powers*, is another Inconsistence with himself; for in his *Origines*, Vol. I. p. 250, 251. he shews, That *“ Op-*
tatus

“*Optatus* gives all the Three Orders of Bishops,
 “*Presbyters* and **Deacons**, the Title of **Priest-**
 “**hood:**”—That, “according to him, every Order
 “had its Share tho’ in different Degrees in the Chri-
 “*stian Priesthood:*” That “Bishops, *Presbyters*
 “and **Deacons** had each their respective Share in
 “the Priesthood:” That it was one Act of the
 “**Priest’s Office** to offer up the Sacrifices of the
 “*Peoples Prayers,*” &c. And that “another Act
 “of the Office [*i.e.* the Priest’s Office] was in
 “God’s Name to bless the People, particularly by
 “admitting them to the Benefit of Remission of Sins,
 “by Spiritual Regeneration or **Baptism:**” That
 “thus far **Deacons** were anciently allowed to mi-
 “nister in Holy Things, as **Mediators** between
 “God and the People.”—And Lastly, in his 2d
 Vol. Chap. 1. where he is shewing, how the infe-
 rior Orders of the Clergy, in the Primitive Church,
 “differ’d from the **superior Orders** of Bishops, *Pres-*
 “*byters* and **Deacons.**” He says of these superior
 Orders, p. 9, 10. That they are by the Antients
 call’d “Holy and Sacred, the **Hierarchy:**”—
 That “they were always ordain’d at the Altar,”—
 with the Solemn Rite of “*Imposition of Hands,*”—
 “to minister before God as **Priests,**” in which re-
 spects, “**Deacons** are said by *Optatus* and others,
 “to have their Share and Degree in the Christian
 “**Priesthood:**” And Mr. Bingham quotes the Re-
 verend and Learned Dr. Hicks’s Opinion to the
 same Purpose, without gain-saying it, Vol. I. p. 251.
 But notwithstanding all this, our Historian so far
 forgets his *Origines*, as now, to make Deacons Bap-
 tizing, an Instance of Persons Baptizing, without
 Sacerdotal Powers: Nay, Thirdly, even his intro-
 ducing Baptism by “*Lay-men in extraordinary Cases,*
 “if they had the **Bishop’s Authority;**” as another

Instance of Persons Baptizing without *Sacerdotal Powers*, is another Contradiction to what he had said before, *p. 8. viz.* “That when [Baptism] was done by others, it was still done by the Bishop’s Authority, and reputed his Act.” Now the Bishop’s Act, I hope, is a *Sacerdotal Power*; and if a Lay-man can be so far authoriz’d by his Bishop, as that the Lay-man’s Act of Baptism shall be reputed to be the Bishop’s Act, Is not this supposed Baptism founded upon a *Sacerdotal Power*, when the Baptism by such a Lay-man (if there can be such a one) is the Bishop’s Act? Again, the Reverend Historian in his *Origines*, Vol. I. *p. 42.* has been so kind to Lay-ministrations, as to tell us, without endeavouring to refute the Notion, that *Tertullian* grants no other Priesthood to Lay-men, save “that they may Baptize in Case of absolute Necessity, &c.” These are our Historian’s own Words, “No other Priesthood, save that, they may Baptize;” which is plainly to make the Power of Baptizing, a Power of Priesthood. Let *Tertullian*’s Opinion about Lay-men be true or false for the present; Mr. *Bingham* here makes Baptism to be one Part of Priesthood, by saying, “No other Priesthood, save that they may Baptize;” And therefore, if Lay-men “may Baptize,” they therein have one Power of Priesthood at least, according to our Author in his *Origines*; but, on the contrary, in his *Scholastical History*, their Baptizing even with the Bishop’s Authority, is an Instance of Baptism not founded on a *Sacerdotal Power*: These things do not hang well together. However, I charitably hope, they are but meer Slips, the Effects of Human Frailty, and not purposely design’d by our Reverend Historian.

§ IX. His second suppos’d Reason against the Antients allowing the Validity of Baptisms, perform’d
by

by *irregular Priests*, to be founded on their *indelible Character*, is this, p. 10, 11. “ *The indelible Character of a Priest, do’s not authorize or qualifie him to act contrary to the Commission of his Bishop: For then his Baptizing would be authorized and unauthorized, regular and irregular, lawful and unlawful, at the same Time, and in the very same Act and Respect, which is a manifest Contradiction.*”

In this there is a great deal of Art, but no good Reasoning; for an *irregular Priest’s Act of Baptizing* simply consider’d, is *not contrary to the Commission of his Bishop*, but ’tis doing exactly that which his Bishop commission’d him to do, when he Baptizes with Water, in the Name of *the Trinity*, and when his Commission was not before made Null and Void by that Power which vested him with it: He commits some Irregularity indeed against the Laws of the Church; but his Power to Baptize, if ’tis *not null’d*, still remains, and therefore in *Baptizing*, he acts nothing without, or contrary to the *Bishop’s Commission* to Baptize, wherewith he still remains invested: He rebels against his Bishop by Baptizing in some prohibited Circumstance, by exercising his Function illegally; and in so doing opposes the Laws of the Church, as a Priest of the Church of *England* do’s, when he unnecessarily Baptizes in private Houses, or when he Baptizes Children without God-fathers and God-mothers, or when he uses the Publick instead of the Private Form in Houses: But his Sin is not against his Bishop’s Commission it self to Baptize, but against some Circumstantial Law relating to the Execution of the Commission. So that his Act of Baptizing is not, as Mr. *Bingham* says, both authoriz’d and unauthoriz’d, for ’tis authoriz’d; but the Circumstance that attends it, is *unauthoriz’d*. The Baptism

tism it self is *regular*, because done by virtue of a Commission still remaining; but the Circumstance is irregular, because against a Circumstantial Rule. And the Baptism it self is *lawful*, because no other than commission'd Baptism; but the Circumstance *unlawful*, because contrary to a Circumstantial Law, as is plain by the above-mention'd Instance of an irregular Priest of the Church of *England's* illegally executing his Commission to Baptize. So that the manifest Contradiction Mr. *Bingham* talks of, as arising from a Supposition of the indelible Character of an irregular Priest, and the Validity of his Baptism founded thereon, do's not appear; for Baptism, by such a Priest, is not "*both authoriz'd and unauthoriz'd, regular and irregular, lawful and unlawful, at the same Time, and in the very same Act and Respect:*" For the **very same Act** is even at that **same time** *authoriz'd, regular, and lawful* in it self, because commission'd; but the Circumstance only, is *unauthoriz'd, irregular and unlawful*. The Irregularity is not *ad idem, secundum idem, & eodem respectu*, and therefore no Contradiction; that is, the *Act it self being commission'd*, is right; but the Circumstance which accompanies the Act is wrong: And therefore the Act it self stands good and valid, tho' the Circumstance attending it ought sincerely to be repented of, by all that are any ways concern'd in it, which implies no Contradiction at all.

Our Historian, if he would have done any thing here to the Purpose, should have produc'd Authorities from those Antients, who allow'd of the Validity of Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, administred by heretical, schismatical, and other irregular Priests; I say, he should have given us a History of such Antients, nulling and making void the Commission of those

those Priests during their Heresy, Schism, or other Irregularity; or he should have given us Instances from such Antients, that they judg'd such Priests Commissions to be made null and void by their Heresy, Schism, or Irregularity it self; without one of these he does nothing: As yet he has given us no such Instance, and indeed he never will. For 'tis notorious, that those ancient Churches which allow'd of the *Validity* of those Baptisms, did also acknowledge the *Holy Orders of the Baptizers*, and esteem'd their Episcopal Ordination to be good and valid—Witness the Council of Nice, Anno 325. which decreed concerning the *Novatian* Schismatics, who came over to the Catholick and Apostolick Church, thus; “**They who are ordain'd shall continue in the Clergy.**” * Or, as Mr. Bingham himself words it, *Scholastical History*, p. 92. “*The Great Council of Nice decreed, That upon their return to the Church, they should continue in the same Station and Clerical Degrees they were in before, only receiving a reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by way of Absolution.*” “These Puritans were not only Orthodox as to their Faith, but they retained *Episcopal Ordination*; therefore Orders receiv'd among them, were not look'd upon as *Null or Invalid.*” And “the Church of *Africa* † allow'd the Ordinations, as well as Baptisms” of the *Donatist* Schismatics, who also retain'd *Episcopacy* to be valid. All which plainly shews, that those ancient Churches, who esteem'd the Baptisms we speak of to be valid, did also

* Canon 8. according to Balsamon, and Zonaras, and Bishop Beveridge; vid. Clergyman's Vade-Mecum, Part. 2. p. 48.

† African Cede, in the Clergyman's Vade-Mecum, Canon 68, 69, & 118.

reckon the Priestly Character of those Schismatical Clergy-men, who perform'd them, to be at least *so far Indeleted*, as that they did not lose that Sacred Character, even in their Schism; That the Schism it self did not blot it out, but that it still remain'd upon them; otherwise they could not have admitted them *to Continue* or Remain among the Clergy, upon their Conversion, as they certainly did, **without Re-Ordination.**

For these Reasons, 'tis plain, that those Antients reckon'd the Character of the Priesthood to be *Indeleted*, so long as it was not actually Blotted out or Taken away by that very Authority, *i. e.* the Episcopal Power which at first gave it: And therefore all Mr. Bingham's Arguings, against those Antients founding the Validity of Baptisms (perform'd by such Irregular Priests) upon their *Indelible* Character, amount to nothing; because, tho' Priests should be prov'd, not to have an **absolutely Indelible Character**, yet so long as their Sacerdotal Character is not *Deleted* by the Authority which gave it, it must remain *Indeleted*, as it did in the Case before us, except our Historian can find some other way, whereby they may be depriv'd of it, and which those Antients acknowledg'd did actually so deprive them. — But this he has not yet done.

§ X. However, as if he had made it good, That the Character of the Priesthood of those Irregular Priests was lost; he tells us, “*That the Irregular Baptisms of such Priests, being esteem'd Valid, so as not to be repeated, tho' Irregularly and Unlawfully given, could not be thought Valid, upon the Notion of their being once Ordain'd Priests, and having an Indelible Character*” of

“ of the Priesthood upon them; but upon some
 “ other Notion and Foundation, which equally ex-
 “ tended to **Deacons** as well as **Priests**; and
 “ made the Baptism of a Deacon, tho’ Irregularly and
 “ Unlawfully perform’d, as Valid as that of a Priest,
 “ in the same Circumstances: And that must be
 “ (says he) upon one of these two Grounds, either,
 “ That Baptism, by **whomsoever Christian** per-
 “ form’d, was Valid, and not to be repeated, pro-
 “ vided it was done with due Matter and Form: Or
 “ else, That the Bishops of the Church, as Chief Mi-
 “ nisters of Baptism, had Power to Receive and Con-
 “ firm those Baptisms, which were otherwise Irre-
 “ gularly, and in Opposition to their Authority and
 “ Commission, perform’d in the Church, p. 11, 12.

Here we see again confirm’d, what I observ’d be-
 fore, That our Historian separates *Deacons*, from
 such as have the Character of *Priesthood*; and
 thereby contradicts himself: See p. 17. before. But
 the Design of this is plain, by his Two proposed
 Guesses, which are evidently made to promote the
 Belief of One of these Two Things; 1st, That
 those Antients reckon’d Baptism perform’d with
 Water, in the Name of the Trinity, by *any Chri-
 stian*, tho’ never Commission’d to Baptize, was Good
 and Valid, (not excepting Apostate or Excommu-
 nicate Christians) nay, even tho’ it were done
 by such *Uncommission’d* Persons, in Opposition to
 the Divine Right of the Apostolick Order, *i. e.* Epi-
 scopacy; for, he says, “ by **whomsoever Chri-
 stian** perform’d: Which is a Latitude of that vast
 Extent, that it sufficiently justifies the Severity of
 my Observation.

But then, if this should fail, and such Bap-
 tisms be prov’d Null and Void, then he reckons,
 2^{dly}, That Bishops might Confirm and thereby

make such Baptisms to become Valid. If One of these Two be not his Design, then he designs nothing at all; and so might have spar'd us the trouble of concerning our selves with such his Guesses; and if he do's design to induce us to believe either of those Notions, he must bring better Evidence for the Truth thereof, than has yet been produc'd, or than what his *Scholastical History* can furnish us withal: He seems to be something sensible of this, in his following Words; for, not trusting wholly to either of those Two supposititious Principles, he concludes his Paragraph, thus;

*“ But however it was, (says he) this is certain,
 “ That the Validity of an Irregular Priest's Baptism,
 “ was not owing to his Indelible Character; since the
 “ Baptism of Deacons, and Lay-men who had not
 “ the Character of Priests, was sometimes authoriz'd
 “ and allow'd as Valid; which is evident from plain
 “ Matters of Fact, which I now proceed to give a
 “ further Account of, (says our Historian, p. 12.—)*

Upon which 'tis very remarkable, that hitherto he *hesitates* concerning the *Certainty* of his Two foregoing Suppositions, — by saying, *“ However
 “ it was; ”* tho' he had said just before, that it *“ must be upon one of those two Grounds; first,* lifting us up with the Expectation of a Certainty, by his [*must be;*] and then letting us fall into our former Doubtfulness, by his [*however it was:*]

But at last, after these various Fluctuations, he endeavours to fix our Minds, upon what, he says *“ is certain, viz. That the Validity of an Irregular
 “ Priest's Baptism was not owing to his Indelible Cha-
 “ racter: ”* And this is answer'd, by saying, that his Character was *Indeleted*, it remain'd good, because not blotted out by the same Powers who impress'd it. Those Powers did not pretend to take
 away

away his Character, as we have before observ'd ; therefore the Baptisms perform'd by him were Sacerdotal, and so founded upon a *Sacerdotal Commission*, and consequently Valid ; and his following pretended Reason to the contrary, viz. That "*the Validity of the Baptism was not owing to his*" "*Indelible Character, since the Baptism of*" "*Deacons and Lay-men, who had not the Cha-*" "*racter of Priests, was sometimes authoriz'd and*" "*allow'd as Valid,*" is an evident Falacy ; because built upon a false Foundation, That *Deacons* had not the Character of Priests, when himself acknowledges, in other Places before noted in p. 17. That *Deacons* have their Share in the *Christian Priesthood* ; nay, and he has given the Name or Character of *Priesthood*, even to Lay-men Baptizing in Case of Necessity, as I have prov'd before in p. 17, 18.

§ XI. He next proceeds to give us an Historical Account of *Deacons* Baptizing ; and tells us, That they, "*by some ancient Canons, are invested with*" "*the Power of Baptizing in Ordinary Cases, as*" "*well as Priests,* p. 12. That "*some other An-*" "*cient Rules seem absolutely to forbid Deacons to*" "*minister Baptism in Ordinary Cases, confining the*" "*Office only to Bishops and Presbyters,* p. 14, for which he produces the Canons call'd Apostolical, and the Constitutions under the Names of the Apostles : That "*yet notwithstanding this, —*" "*a Deacon may Baptize, if he has a Commission and*" "*Authority from his Bishop to do it,* p. 16. — for which he quotes the same Constitutions : That, "*In Case of Necessity, [St. Chrysostom] not only*" "*permits, but positively enjoins Deacons to Baptize,* p. 18 : And proceeding upon the same Subjects to
p. 22.

p. 22. he at last concludes thus; “So Necessary,
 “we see, was this Distinction between Ordinary
 “and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters, in
 “the Practice of the Primitive Church; whilst, on
 “the one hand, the Honour and Dignity of the
 “Priesthood was to be preserv’d; and yet Deacons
 “allow’d on the other hand, to minister Baptism in
 “some Cases, tho’ they were not Priests in the
 “strict sense, in the Opinion of those who allow’d
 “them to do it.

This of Deacons not being Priests in the strict sense, amounts to no more than saying, they are not Bishops; for Bishops alone have the whole Power of the Christian Priesthood in themselves; but others derive the Priesthood from them, as Presbyters do in the next subordinate Degree; and Deacons under them, in the third and lowest Order; as Mr. Bingham himself has observ’d. And as for the Necessity of a Distinction between Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters in the Practice of the Primitive Church; this is certain, from all that he has said to this part of his History; That as the Apostolick Commission was always insisted upon, to Impower Men to Baptize in Ordinary, so it was likewise requir’d to Impower them to Baptize in Extraordinary Cases; to the intent that this Commission might “Continue to the
 “End of the World;” because it was “Necessary to Preserve the Church, according to
 “the Order of Christ, — in future Ages;” as our Historian has excellently observ’d, in his p. 3. and upon which I have remark’d, p. 5, 6. For this, the Three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, were Instituted, that they might, the Inferior in subordination to the Superior, minister Baptism by the same Commission, in Ordinary
 and

and **Extraordinary Cases** too, and that in the Absence of one, the other might still be enabled to supply the Wants of the Church, by one and the same **commission'd Baptism**. The Restraining of Presbyters and Deacons, sometimes from the Exercise of this Power, during the Presence of the Bishop, was to preserve the Dignity of the Superior Order, and to keep the Inferior in that just Subordination which 'twas their Duty to observe (as in our Church the Priest is not to give the Blessing in Presence of the Bishop, nor the Deacon to Baptize in Presence of the Presbyter;) but this *occasional* Restraining the Exercise of their Function for some Times and Circumstances, was not a taking away their Commission to Baptize in those Circumstances, but only a making them give way to their Superiors: For which Reason, Deacons, who were Priests of the Third Order, and in their Ordination were vested with a Commission to Baptize, were also restrain'd from the Exercise of that Function during the Presence of a **Priest** of the Second Order, to preserve the Dignity of the Second Order. But this Restraining was no more a Nulling or making Void the Deacon's Commission which he had receiv'd to Baptize, than it was of the Priests; for we do not find by any thing which our Historian has yet produc'd, that Clergy-men, of any Order, transgressing these Circumstantial Rules of the Church, were actually divested of their *Commission* by *those ancient Churches* who esteem'd their Ministrations valid: On the contrary we see, by the *Nicene Council*, and the *African Code*, before referr'd to, that the Commissions of irregular Clergy-men, whether Bishops, Priests or Deacons (who had acted in Schism which they ought not to have done) remain'd still good and valid; for those Churches did not require them to be

be re-consecrated or re-ordain'd. Our Historian then, if he would make the irregular Practices of Deacons Baptizing in Circumstances prohibited by the Church, to be equivalent to the attempted Usurpations of Persons, who *never were at all commission'd to Baptize*, and who yet presume to endeavour to do it, even in opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Order, must, *1st*, produce Instances of such Non-episcopal, or Anti-episcopal Deacons, who never receiv'd a Commission at all to Baptize, and yet presum'd to attempt that Holy Ministration. *2dly*, He must prove, that the Antients held such their pretended Baptisms, if ever there were any, to be good and valid. *3dly*, He must make it clear, that the ancient Catholick Church, as well as some particular Men, thought so too: Or, *4thly*, in Case he fails of these (as I am confident he will) then he must prove, that the ancient Catholick Church held Deacons Commissions to Baptize, to be null'd and made void by their Baptizing irregularly; but that, at the same time, those very Baptisms were good and valid, if done with Water in the Name of the Trinity: Either he must prove this Fourth, or the other Three Propositions, else it will stand good, that the Irregularities of ancient Deacons Baptizing contrary to some Circumstantial Rules of the Church, have no Comparison with those *Essential Irregularities* which our Modern, *never commission'd* Usurpers, commit, who act in Opposition to that very *Apostolick Commission* which Mr. Bingham himself acknowledges, in effect, to have an *essential* relation to Baptism, by saying, That it was "**to continue**" "**to the End of the World;**" and that it was "**necessary to preserve the Church, &c.**" For he can say *no more* than this concerning the Water,
and

Chap. 2. *and constant Necessity thereof.* 29

and the Form in the Name of the Trinity; and therefore makes the Apostolick Commission, *as much* an Essential of the Institution, as they are.

§ XII. Our Historian's *"next Question, is concerning Sub-deacons, and the rest of the Inferior Orders, who went by the Name of the Minor Clergy in the Primitive Church;—Whether in any Cases they had Power to Baptize?"* p. 22, 23. And upon this he concludes, That *"they had no Power in ordinary Cases:"* Whether they had in any extraordinary ones, he says, *"There are few among the Antients that have in direct Terms decided, p. 23."* At last he concludes that this Question may be decided thus: *"If the Antients (says he) granted Liberty to meer Monks and Lay-men to Baptize in extraordinary Cases, it will readily follow, that they would never scruple to grant the same Power to the Inferior Clergy, who were at least one Degree above Monks and Lay-men. We cannot therefore better determine this Question, than by proceeding to that other concerning the Power granted to Lay-men, in reference to the Administration of Baptism; which is the grand Question in this whole Affair, p. 24."*

C H A P.

C H A P. III.

Testimonies for and against Lay-Baptisms; and all Mr. Bingham's Evidences examin'd and prov'd to make nothing for the pretended Validity of Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize.

§ I. **O**UR Author first acknowledges, that "it is certain that Lay-men were always debarr'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all ordinary Cases. Here then comes in a very apt Question, By what Law or Rule shall Baptism by Lay-men in ordinary Cases be pronounc'd good and valid? How shall that Baptism, which is given by Persons who never were at all commission'd to Baptize, and who attempt to do it ordinarily, be determin'd to be valid? Is not this a Law Case, a Question to be answer'd only by the Rule of our Christian Law, and the Enforcement thereof by the Laws of the Catholick Church? The Christian Law, viz. the Institution of Baptism, excludes such never commission'd Persons; and the Laws of the Church "always debarr'd them," by our Reverend Historian's own Confession; Where then shall we seek for, and find the Validity of their pretended Ministrations? Is it to be determin'd without a Law or Rule? By what then shall they be guided, who endeavour to perswade us of their Validity? Is arbitrary Will and Pleasure alone sufficient to convince the Judgment? Or, is there such a Charm in the Formality of seriously imitating an opus operatum alone, as that a Thing shall

shall be Good and Valid, when done; tho' done without, and contrary to, something else, which the Law makes **Essential** to the very Doing thereof? This will be New, indeed; for "*it is certain, that Lay-men were always debarr'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all Ordinary Cases;*" To which I add, They were *always* so debarr'd, both by the Law of God, and of his Church; and therefore, our *Dissenters* Baptisms are destitute of *any Law* for their Validity, because perform'd by *Lay-men* in *Ordinary Cases*; and consequently, they who pronounce them Valid, esteem them to be Valid without Law: And how safe this is, in a Matter of such vast Moment; how satisfying to those who want to be secur'd of a Valid Baptism; I leave the Defenders of such a *Novel* Opinion to Answer.

§ II. But, it may be, some will say, That these Baptisms may be pronounced Valid, upon the same account as Baptisms perform'd by Irregular Deacons were. To which I Answer; If that be true, then these Lay-men must be prov'd to be equal in Power and Authority with such Irregular Deacons. But our Reverend Historian will not allow this; for he immediately subjoins, "*All the former Allegations, which make it the proper Office of Bishops and Presbyters, even to the exclusion of Deacons, are certainly of much greater Force against the Usurpations of Lay-men,* p. 22. Which plainly makes the Case of such Lay-Usurpations to be very different from that of Irregular Deacons; and therefore, whatsoever Arguments will hold for the Validity of such Deacons Baptisms, will be no-ways competent for the Validity of those Lay-Baptisms.

§ III. “ But (says Mr. Bingham) still the Grand
 “ Question remains, Whether ever they [*i.e.* Lay-
 “ men] were allow’d to do it in Extraordinary Cases
 “ of extreme Necessity, when no Publick Minister
 “ could be procur’d to do it? And this (says he)
 “ must be resolv’d in the Affirmative, as to the gene-
 “ ral Practice of the Church, tho’ there are
 “ some Exceptions of particular Churches to
 “ the contrary, p. 25. But, with submission, tho’
 the Question propos’d, and endeavour’d to be re-
 solv’d, by the Reverend Historian, in the Affirma-
 tive, be worth enquiring into; yet it is not the
 grand Question which now exercises the Church:
 For, that about which we are now concern’d, is,
 Whether Persons never once commission’d at all
 to Baptize, can administer Valid Baptism, especially,
 when they attempt to Baptize, even in Opposition
 to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Commis-
 sion, to be receiv’d only from Bishops, the Suc-
 cessors of the Apostles? And, Whether the An-
 cient Catholick Church has given her Testimony
 for the Validity of these pretended Baptisms?
 This is the Great Thing that ought to be enquir’d
 into, and fairly determin’d either in the Negative,
 or the Affirmative, according to the just Merits
 of the Cause. And this, our Reverend Author’s
 Scholastical History cannot resolve in the Affirma-
 tive; even tho’ he could prove, (as he cannot)
 That Lay-men “ were allow’d to Baptize in Ex-
 “ traordinary Cases, when no Publick Minister could
 “ be procur’d to do it, and that they were so in the
 General Practice of the Church: His Testimonies
 for which, I come now to examine; and shall, as
 I go along, see of what Use they are to the Great
 Question now before us, Of Baptism by Persons
 never Commission’d to Baptize.

§ IV. And, *First*, 'Tis very remarkable, That our Reverend Historian can produce no Testimonies from the Apostles, or their Contemporaries; Nor from the Apostolick Fathers who next succeeded them; Nor, lastly, from any of the Antients who liv'd before *Tertullian*: So that, for about the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, we hear nothing of Lay-Baptisms being administer'd, nor of any thing in favour of them, either directly or indirectly. A strange and long Silence this, in a Matter which is pretended to be the "**general Practice of the Church.**" What would the Adversaries against Episcopacy say, if Antiquity had been so long silent about the Power and Authority of Bishops? And then, by what Rule should we have been determin'd of the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy, if *Scripture*, and the Writings of the Antients for about the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, had been so absolutely silent about it, as they are about the Validity of Lay-Baptism?

§ V. But, *Secondly*, In a Matter of such Importance as this is, if it had been the **general practice** of the Church, and so safely to be rely'd on, as some represent it to be; would there have been any *considerable Exceptions* against so **general a practice**, insomuch, as that whole Churches have refus'd to come in to it; or, to use the Reverend Historian's Words, Would there have been "*some Exceptions of particular Churches to the contrary?*" Do's not this spoil the Practice's being **Catholick**, while **particular Churches**, Contemporary with those other Churches who are suppos'd to have practis'd it, refus'd to suffer or
D allow

allow of any such Practice. In this supposed Difference of the Churches, some will say, That one Side was wrong, for *allowing*, what the other Side *refus'd* to allow; and others, 'tis likely, will say, That these latter were in the wrong, and those others in the right: What must we then do, when we find such a Difference? Certainly, we must have **some Rule** or other, whereby to discover which of them was in the wrong, and which in the right; otherwise, the Fundamentals of Religion must be determin'd only by Number of *Votes*; (which God forbid:) This Rule must be the Holy Scripture, and therein, the Divine Positive Institution of Baptism, and the Laws of God about such Positive Institutions as that is; all which do *as much* exclude Persons who *never were Commission'd*, as they do any *Matter* and *Form* which were *never Appointed*: And 'tis by this Rule of the Holy Scripture, that the *different Practices* of Churches must be tried; and by which, sometimes, the fewest have been found to be in the right, whilst the greater Number have been in the wrong: But here there is no fear of any such Matter, with respect to those Ancient Churches who allow'd, and the other Ancient Churches who did not allow of, the Validity of Lay-Baptism: For all the suppos'd Evidence that is brought for Defence of it, will not amount to a *Catholick Tradition*; being destitute of any Proof from Scripture, and the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, as 'tis also of the Authority of any *one ancient General Council* that ever was Held in the Church of Christ, and consists only of a false Notion of *Tertullian's*, about the Year 200; a particular Provincial Council of *Spanish Bishops*, Held, some think, *Anno 305*; a fabulous Story of a Baptism by Boys in Play, about

about the same time ; a Notion of St. *Ferom's*, founded upon *Tertullian's* false Principle, and inconsistent with himself ; *Optatus's* Dangerous Position, if it can be interpreted as some Men would have it ; St. *Augustin's* ill-grounded Opinion ; These in the Fourth Century : A Saying of *Gelasius* Bishop of Rome, Anno 492 ; and another of *Isidore* Bishop of Sevil, Anno 595. These are all that can be found in the first Six hundred Years of Christianity ; — and the strength of their Evidence is now to be enquired into, and other opposite Evidences to be brought against them —

§ VI. But before I concern my self with Mr. *Bingham's* Evidences, I shall take what offers it self against these Baptisms, from the Days of the Apostles. —

St. *Ignatius*, about the Year of Christ 71, affirms, That * “ *It is not lawful, without the Bishop, to Baptize.* That, “ *Without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, there is no Church of the Elect:* And, That “ *He is without, who do's any thing without the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons.* These are that Apostolick Father's positive Assertions, relating to those Sacred Ministrations, which were deposited in the Hands of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.* It is not *Lawful*, (says he) *without the Bishop, to Baptize.* In these Words there are Two Things to be enquired into : 1st, What he means by *Without the Bishop* ? It is not to be suppos'd that St. *Ignatius* meant, that the Bishop must always be present in Person at every Baptism ; for we find, that *Philip* the Deacon Baptiz'd, in the

* Epist. to the *Smyrneans*, N. 8. Epist. to the *Trallians*, N. 2, 3, 7.

the Absence of the Apostles ; and Presbyters and Deacons were Instituted to Officiate, in those Sacred Functions to which they were Ordain'd, in the Absence as well as in the Presence of the Bishop ; and this, by reason 'twas impossible for the Bishop always to be Personally present : And therefore, *without the Bishop*, must signifie, without Commission or Authority receiv'd from the Bishop ; Presbyters and Deacons then being Men Authoriz'd and Commission'd by the Bishop to Baptize, are not here spoken of ; but Persons who never were so Commission'd, and are therefore call'd *Laicks*. 2dly, What Law do's this blessed Saint and Martyr refer us to, when he says, *It is not Lawful* ? It must be either to the Law of God, or to the Law of the Church, or to both of these together : If to the Law of God ; then, 'tis plain, that Baptism by a Person who never had a Commission from the Bishop, if any such had then been attempted, would have been contrary to the Law of God, and therefore there was no Law of God by which to pronounce it Valid ; consequently, no Valid Law of the Church for that Purpose ; because, the Church can have no Law sufficient to make that Valid before God, which is not Valid by any of his Laws. If *St. Ignatius* refers us to any Laws of the Church, and means, that, in respect of those Laws, "*it is not Lawful* ;" then, 'tis plain, that the Church had at that time no Law of hers, whereby such a suppos'd Baptism could have been pronounc'd Valid, *in the sense of the Church* ; In such Case, its pretended Validity must have been judg'd of by some *previous Law* of God : But that Law is not to be found ; and therefore, such a suppos'd Baptism could not have been pronounc'd Valid, by virtue any the then Laws
of

of the Church. *Lastly*, If *St. Ignatius* has an eye to both the Laws of God, and his Church; then, such a suppos'd Baptism must not have been Valid, by virtue of any Law whatsoever; and therefore Invalid, for want of all Law whatsoever to give it Validity. And this is the more confirm'd, by his asserting, That *without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, there is *no Church of the Elect*; and, that He is "**Without,**" *i. e.* Out of the Church, "*who do's any thing,* [*i. e.* any Sacred Positive Function, that belongs peculiarly to the Office of the Clergy,] "*without the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons.*" For in those Days, if Laicks had attempted such Ministrations, they, and their Dependants, being and having "*no Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,*" but acting without them, would have been **no Church**; and if *no Church*, then their pretended Ministrations would have been **no Christian Sacraments**; because, where there is "**no Church,** there are *no Sacraments*; and therefore *no Baptism*."

The only Question that remains, is, Whether *St. Ignatius's* Words are not to be restrain'd to Ordinary Cases only; and, whether Extraordinary Cases, where *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons* cannot be had, are not to be excepted? In Answer to which, 'tis plain that *St. Ignatius* makes no Exceptions; his Words are general, and he refers to no Rule or Custom then in the Church, for any Exception whatsoever; so that, if Men will make Exceptions, they must have *reason* to do so; otherwise their Exceptions will be arbitrary, and without foundation. If there be any reason for an Exception, it must be founded either on the Law of Nature, or else the Positive Revealed Law of God: The Law of Nature has no Rule for such an Exception, because Baptism is a thing

about which that Law is no-ways concern'd; and the Reveal'd Positive Law of God has no such Rule for such an Exception; if it has, Where is it? It has not yet been produc'd; so that Men have nothing whereon to ground such an Exception. Some, it may be, will suppose, that the Church had then a Law or Rule that excepted such Extraordinary Cases: But Supposing, without Proving, will not do; and they cannot shew us any such early Primitive Law; and consequently, St. Ignatius's Words cannot be fairly interpreted to be restrain'd to Ordinary Cases only, and therefore they must include Extraordinary Cases also.

§ VII. St. *Hermas*, who was Cotemporary with St. *Paul*, tho' he had so strict an Opinion of the * Necessity of Baptism, that he reckon'd the *Righteous Men and Prophets*, who Dy'd before the Coming of Christ, stood in need of Christian Baptism, even in their Separate State; yet, to supply this their Necessity, none are mention'd by him to have gone to them to give 'em Baptism, but "† *The Apostles and Doctors of the Preaching of the Son of God.*" *The Apostles and Teachers, who preach'd the Name of the Son of God;*" Men who had Christ's and the Apostles Commission to minister in Holy Things; not the least Hint of any who never were Commission'd to Baptize, that went to supply their want of Baptism. But if our modern Notion, That *Laicks, in want of the Clergy, may Baptize*, had then been held by the Church; considering, that the Laity were always vastly more Numerous than the Clergy, it

* *Vif. iii. N. 3. Simil. xix. N. 15, 16.*

† *Simil. xix. N. 15.*

would have been but natural enough to suppose, that some of those Prophets, &c. were baptiz'd by common Christians also; but in this our *St. Hermas* is absolutely silent, and mentions no other Baptizers, for this suppos'd Case of Necessity, than the Apostles and Teachers, who preach'd the Name of the Son of God: And how could they Preach except they were sent or commission'd? according to the Great Apostle of the Gentiles. But to come now to Mr. Bingham's Evidences:

§ VIII. This Reverend Historian gives us first of all, *Tertullian's* Opinion upon the Matter, about the Year of Christ 200, translated from his Book *de Baptismo*, c. 17. Thus “the chief Priest, who is
“the Bishop, has Power to give Baptism; and after
“him Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the
“Authority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the
“Church, in the Preservation of which Peace is
“preserv'd. In another Respect, Lay-men have
“also a Right to give it; for what is received in com-
“mon, may be given in common. Baptism is God's
“peculiar, and may be conferr'd by all. But Lay-
“men are in a much greater Degree obliged by the
“Rules of Modesty in the Use of their Power, since
“they, who are Superior to them, are obliged not
“to assume to themselves the Office which belongs to
“the Bishop only: Emulation is the Mother of Strife;
“all things are Lawful says the Apostle, but all things
“are not Expedient. Therefore it ought to suffice
“them to use this Power in Necessities, when the
“Condition of the Place, or Time, or Person
“requires it: For then their charitable Assistance is
“accepted, when the Circumstance of one in Danger
“presses them to it. And in this Case he would be
“guilty of a Man's Destruction, that omitted to do

“*what he lawfully might,*” p. 25, 26. Thus far *Tertullian’s* Opinion. But by what Rule shall we discover that it was then a Catholick Tradition of the Church, and not *Tertullian’s* private Opinion only? Our Reverend Historian would have it, That ’twas then “*the common Practice of the Church:*” 1st, Because “*no learned Man before*” Mr. Dodwell, and some others, “*ever thought*” that it was “*only*” *Tertullian’s* own private Opinion, and not the common Practice of the Church:” 2dly, Because of “*the Coherence of Tertullian’s Discourse.*” “*In the former Part of it (says Mr. Bingham) he is certainly speaking of the Practice of the Church, when he says, Presbyters and Deacons act by the Bishop’s Authority, when they administer Baptism in ordinary Cases. It would be strange then, if he should invert his Discourse immediately in the next Words, and not mean the Practice of the Church, when he comes to speak of Lay-men,*” p. 27. These are Mr. Bingham’s Two suppos’d Reasons: The First amounts to nothing; because our Reverend Historian cannot prove, that all Learned Men, before Mr. Dodwell, &c. esteemed this Passage of *Tertullian’s*, to be an Evidence of the General Practice of the Church. What *no Learned Man ever thought* before Mr. Dodwell, and others, is a meer Negative, and hard to be discover’d, except by some positive Declaration; so that till Mr. Bingham produces the Declaration of those Learned Men, shewing, that this Passage of *Tertullian* is an Evidence for the General Practice of the Church, his saying that “*no Learned Man before [Mr. Dodwell] ever thought,*” as Mr. Dodwell, and some others thought, is giving no Reason at all: As neither would his producing their Testimony only, if it were not also back’d with such Arguments for the Truth

Truth of their Evidence, as will stand a fair Examination. And then, as to the Second, viz. "*The*" "*[suppos'd] Coherence of Tertullian's Discourse,*" &c. Upon a just Observation of his own Words, it will be found, that his Notion was not the Practice of the Church; for as Mr. Bingham himself acknowledges, *Tertullian's* Words do plainly respect the Church's Practice in the former Part of his Discourse, where he speaks of the *Power of the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, to Baptize; and mentions only Priests, and Deacons, as acting in Subordination to, and by *Authority* of the Bishop, "*for the Honour of the Church.*" But what is this *Honour of the Church*, except our submitting to her Rules and Orders? How can her Honour be preserv'd, but by our obeying her just Laws, and following her well-grounded Traditions and Customs? Therefore her Laws and Customs, concerning Baptism, are here referr'd to by *Tertullian*, when he speaks of *her Honour*, in the Power of the Bishop, and under him, of Presbyters and Deacons, to Baptize. His saying immediately after this, *Alioquin*, otherwise, or "*in another respect,*" is a plain Transition from his former Subject of what had a reference to the Church's Law or Custom; and evidently shews, that he is going to say something that is separate and distinct therefrom: For, says he, "*in another respect,*" i. e. in respect of something else foreign to the Church's Law or Custom before referr'd to, "*Lay-men have also a Right to give it:*" As much as if he had said, by the Law or Custom of the Church, "*The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop, has Power to give Baptism, and after him Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the Authority of the Bishop; for the Honour of the Church:*" in the Preservation of which Honour, by our observing

serving this her Law, "*Peace is preserv'd:*" Otherwise, or "*in another respect*" distinct and separate from the Consideration of this Law or Custom, "*Lay-men have also a Right to give it;*" which is the same as saying, that Lay-men have a Right in themselves to Baptize, separate and distinct from the Consideration of the Church's Law or Custom: So that *Tertullian's* Notion of Lay-men's Right to Baptize, is not founded upon any Law or Custom of the Church at that time giving them such a Right, or on any Act of the Bishop pretending to vest them with *his* Authority: So far from these, that he speaks of *Lay-mens Right* by way of *Antithesis* to 'em, by introducing it with an *Alioquin, otherwise*, making it to have "*another respect*" than that of the Church's Law, and *the Bishop's Authority*. Consequently their Right to Baptize, here spoken of by *Tertullian*, being neither founded on any Law of the Church, nor on any Authority receiv'd from the Bishop, must be a pretended Right which the Church never gave them, and therefore is not the Church's Tradition; because 'tis inconceivable how the Church should have a Tradition for **Lay-mens Right** to Baptize, without any Authority receiv'd from the Bishop, when at the same time the Tradition was universal, that all Power to Baptize was originally in the Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops; and that *none could have any Right* to Baptize, but those who were in some respect or other *commission'd* by them: As *Mr. Bingham* has very well observ'd in his 4th and 5th Pages. This shews that *Tertullian's Right of Laymen* to Baptize, was his own particular Notion only.

And this is not a little corroborated by his manner of speaking, when he refers to the Laws and Practice of the Church; for then he gives us
such

such plain Tokens of his speaking about *them*, that we cannot well miss of understanding him. Thus in the Place before us, his speaking of the *Honour of the Church* being preserv'd by the Power of the Bishop to Baptize, and of Priests and Deacons in subordination to, and by his Authority, is an evident Token of his referring to the Church's Law and Practice. So again; When he speaks of Persons who had receiv'd Heretical Baptism, he says, "*We have * a Rule among us to Re-baptize them;*" plainly thereby referring to the Law and Practice of the Church where he liv'd. But nothing like these has he to guide us to the *general Practice* of the Church giving Lay-men a **Right** to Baptize; but the direct contrary, by his *Alioquin*, &c. as has been prov'd before. And therefore, 'tis no other than his own private Opinion, and *no general Practice* of the Church.

§ IX. Which is further confirm'd by the imaginary Reason upon which he endeavours to found their *pretended Right*, and 'tis this: "*For what is received in common, may be given in common;*" as Mr. Bingham Words it. A Principle so false, that multitudes of Instances may be brought to demonstrate its contrariety to Truth and Reason: And even *Tertullian* himself contradicts this Notion a little after in the Case of Baptism by Women, whom he will not allow to have any *Right* at all to Baptize; which certainly they must have, if "*what is received in common, may be given in common.*" For Women as well as Men receive Baptism, and may therefore give it, if this Principle be true, as

* Tertul. de Pudicitia, c. 19. Edit. Rigal. Lutet. 1634.

it most certainly is not, in Cases that relate to a Commission; for 'tis plain, that all the Citizens, properly so call'd, of the City of London, receive the Freedom of the City in common, and yet that Freedom may not be given in common by every such Citizen; it must be done by those Officers of the City, who are in Commission to give Freedoms; otherwise, the pretended Freedom will prove a Nullity in all respects whatsoever. So in Cases of Naturalization of Foreigners, and abundance of other Instances that might be brought to shew the Fallacy of *Tertullian's* false Maxim, the very proposing of which betrays the Weakness of it, and the consequent Danger of that Practice, which is built upon no better Foundation.

§ X. Thus *Tertullian* gives us nothing but his own Word for it, and a false Reason to support it, that "*Lay-men also have a Right to give Baptism.*" And now I would fain know, whether *this alone is sufficient* to convince any reasonable Man, that Lay-men then had such a Right? Is the bare Word of such an ancient Writer, his single Opinion, without the necessary Adjunct of the Church's Rule to support it, a powerful Reason to persuade us, that it was in his Days the general Practice of the Church? If this be enough, then we must swallow *Tertullian's* other *Nostrooms*, as Doctrines and Practices of the Church too; for he is as positive in some of them, as he is in this. Thus he makes *Lay-men to be Priests*, * purely upon a wrong Interpretation of a Text in the First Chapter of the Revelations, which makes all Christians to be as much and as

* Nonne & Laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est Regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes, Deo & Patri suo fecit. Tertul. de Exhor. Castit. cap. 7.

proper Kings, as it makes them proper Priests, *i.e.* not at all. How Christians, as such, are Kings and Priests in a figurative Sense, I have already shew'd in * another Place. He reckons *the difference † between Clergy and Laity to be founded on the Church's Authority*, when, in truth, it is founded on God's Law, and the Institution of Christ himself: In Consequence of this he teaches, that *in the Absence of the Clergy, || Lay-men are Priests for themselves*, and have Power not only to Baptize, but also to Offer and Minister the Memorial of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, [*& Offers & Tinguis*, says he;] nay, further, he affirms, That *where Three are gather'd together, tho' they be but Laicks, they are a Church*: The Consequence of which, is, that they must also have those Spiritual Powers which belong to the Church: Hence they may not only Baptize and Administer the other Sacrament, but also Ordain, Excommunicate, and Absolve, and Retain Sins, otherwise they cannot constitute a Church; which plainly shews the Falseness of the Principle from whence such Consequences flow. And all these are Errors so very notorious, and so contrary to Scripture-Rule, that who can dare to say, they were Traditions of the Catholick, Primitive Church? And yet they must be so, if Tertulian's Notions must be receiv'd for the Church's Doctrines and Practices.

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, 3d Edit. p. 196, &c.

† Differentiam inter ordinem & plebem constituit Ecclesiæ Auctoritas & Honor per ordinis concessum sanctificatus.

|| Adeo ubi Ecclesiastici ordinis non est concessus, & offers, & tinguis, & sacerdos, es tibi solus. ** Sed ubi tres Ecclesia est licet Laici. — *Tertul. de Exhort. Castitatis*, cap. 7. Edit. Rigal. Lutet. Par. 1634.

§ XI. I might also instance several of his other Errors and Paradoxes, as his false Notion, Of the Soul of the First Man's being made out of the Substance of God; His Error concerning the Sex of Souls; That the Soul is corporeal, and not properly a Spirit; That the Soul can suffer nothing without the Body; That God himself is corporeal, because nothing is incorporeal. That Christ, the Son of God, was always seen by Men in true and real Flesh, before he was Born of the Holy Virgin; and, That Second Marriages are as Wicked as Whoredom: These Errors of this ancient Writer, are, with * others mention'd in the Margin, collected together in *Paradoxa Tertulliani cum Antidoto Jacobi Pamellii*, in the 2d Vol. of his Works, Printed at Paris, 1635. — And does his holding them, shew, that the Church held them too?

-
- * 1 De Angelis desertoribus qui duxerunt filias Hominum.
 2 De Angelorum apparitionibus in vera humana carne.
 3 De Anima primi Hominis ex materia Dei.
 4 De Animabus posterorum Adæ ex traduce.
 5 De Animæ Sexu.
 6 Animam peccatricem potius quam carnem.
 7 De Anima corporea, quod proinde propriè spiritus non fit.
 8 Animam nihil pati posse sine corpore.
 11 Animas Hominum pessimas post mortem in Dæmonas verti.
 15 De Deo corporeo, eo quod nihil incorporale sit.
 18 De Ecstasi sive Amentia, sive spiritu Prophetico Montani, & Insanarum Vatum Priscillæ & Maximillæ, & Similium.
 19 Filium Dei Christum, semper visum ab hominibus in vera, etsi non nata carne.
 25 De Nuptiis secundis damnaticis tanquam stupris.
 26 De Paraceto Montano.
 28 Psychicis, quo nomine Catholicis calumniam fecit.

No such Matter; and therefore, his asserting, *Lay-men to have a Right to Baptize*, in Cases of suppos'd *Necessity*, without appealing to the Church's Law or Rule for such a *Right*, is no Argument, that the Church in general held any such Notion; but only proves, that it was his own private Opinion; and consequently, it must stand or fall, by the Goodness or Badness of the Argument which he brings to support it. His Argument has been already prov'd to be false, in the IXth Section of this Chapter: — And therefore, upon the whole, we may fairly conclude, that *Tertullian* is no Evidence of *any general Practice of the Church* countenancing the pretended Right of Lay-men to Baptize, in Case of *Necessity*. Nay, he has not given so much as one Instance of any such Baptism by a Lay-man, allow'd of by the Church; no Historical Account of any such Matter, but only his singular private Opinion, what he thought a Lay-man might do, in want of the Clergy; and this founded upon a false Principle.

But then, as to the Case before us, of Baptism by Laicks, Persons never Commission'd by Bishops, attempting to do this where the Clergy are to be had; *Tertullian* is full and direct against them, and refers us to the Law and Practice of the Church, when he asserts, That “*The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop,*” “*has the Power to give Baptism; and after him,*” “*Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the Au-*” “*thority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the Church.*” This was the standing Rule and Law of the Church, pursuant to the Law of God: So that, if Lay-men had then pretended (as they do now) to have usurp'd the Power of Baptizing, where Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, were to be had; it would have been against the Honour of the Church, a
Breach

Breach of her Law and Custom, as well as of the Law of God ; and consequently, destitute of any Law either of God, or his Church, whereby to judge and pronounce their Usurped Ministration Good and Valid.

And thus our Reverend Historian has produc'd nothing of the **Church's Practice** in favour of Lay-Baptism, in any Case whatsoever, for the space of the first Three hundred Years, the purest Ages of the Christian Church : So that, if I should proceed no farther, but Conclude here, I might venture to say, That the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, never was a Tradition of the Catholick Church, because not attested by her in the purest Ages, the first Three hundred Years of Christianity : But, on the contrary, Baptism by Persons suppos'd to have no Power or Authority from Bishops, was exclaim'd against, in that very Period, by no less Men than the blessed *St. Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch*, as I have prov'd before, *pag. 35* ; by *St. Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage* ; and by *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and their Colleagues. For,

§ XII. About the Year of Christ 256, *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian* held the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics to be *Null and Void*, upon this score, that, Because they were Broken off from the Church, and become *Lay-men*, therefore they had no Power to Baptize : Their being become Lay-men, made them to have no Power to Baptize ; and their want of Power, made their Baptisms Null and Void, in the Opinion of these two Bishops. That this was their Opinion, *St. Basil*, who sat in the Chair of *Cæsarea*, about an Hundred and thirteen Years

Years after *Firmilian*, testifies : And that his Testimony may not be question'd, it shall stand here in Mr. *Bingham's* own Translation, and he introduces it thus : " *St. Basil* brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor in the See of *Cæsarea*, arguing after this manner ;" then follows *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* Argument, thus translated ; * " *Hereticks and Schismatics are broken off from the Church, and become Lay-men, and therefore have no Power to Baptize, or to Ordain ; being no longer able to give the Gift of the Holy-Ghost, which they have lost themselves ; therefore, such as are Baptized by them, are to be Re-baptized with the True Baptism of the Church, as being only Baptized by Lay-men.*

The whole Stress of this Argument, we see, is founded upon *Lay-mens* having no power to Baptize, and the consequent Necessity of giving *True Baptism* to such as were only *Baptiz'd* by *Lay-men*. Whether *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* pronouncing *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* to be no more than *Lay-men*, was right or no ; or, whether they esteem'd them to be redu'd to *Lay-men*, by their *Heresy* or *Schism* only ; or rather, by virtue of the Laws of those Churches to whom they ow'd Subjection ; 'tis no matter at present to enquire : Be that how it will, this is certain, That they made the want of a Commission, i. e. *Lay-mens* want of Power to Baptize, the Standard by which they judg'd of the Invalidity of Baptism by *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* : Baptism by *Lay-men* was Null and Void, in their Opinion ; and they, consequently, pronounc'd Baptism by *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* to be so too, because they esteem'd

* *Basil. Epist. 1. ad Amphilochium, cap. 1.*

them to be but **Lay-men**. This Evidence is very destructive of what some say, That *Tertullian's* Notion about Lay-Baptism, was the *general Practice of the Church* in his Days : For, is it at all likely, that Two such Bishops as these were, should, so soon as about 56 Years after *Tertullian's* Writing his Book *de Baptismo*, make use of such an Argument as this? If *Tertullian's* Notion of the *Validity of Lay-Baptism* had been founded upon the *general Practice* of the Church at that Time, these two Bishops must, at that rate, have been greater Strangers to, and more ignorant of, the Church's *general Practice*, than *Tertullian*, a private Priest ; or else the *general Practice* must have ceas'd, by that time *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian* came to dispute against Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms : Suppositions so ill grounded, that no reasonable Man can believe them ; and 'till there shall be produc'd good Reasons to the contrary, we must conclude, that *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* Opinion, of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, was then a standing Principle, in their Churches at least : Because 'tis unreasonable to believe, that in so Publick a Dispute as that was, about Heretical and Schismatical Baptism, two such celebrated Bishops as *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, should use an Argument founded on the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, if the Validity of Lay-Baptism had at the same time been a received Principle in those Churches. This Testimony of those two great Bishops, upon so Publick an Occasion, That *Lay-Baptism* was then esteem'd to be *Null and Void*, is of so great Consequence, that our Reverend Historian is something particular in his Endeavours to weaken the Credit of it : But his several Objections shall be Answer'd in the following Chapter.

§ XIII. And tho' their Evidence is transmitted to us by St. Basil, and therefore sufficiently establish'd by his Authority; yet even in St. Cyprian's Works themselves, we find good Proofs, that St. Cyprian, Firmilian, and others their Colleagues, held pretended Baptisms to be Null and Void, when perform'd by Persons who were suppos'd by them to have had no Commission to Baptize. Thus St. Cyprian, in his Epistle to *Januarius* *, says, "It is necessary that Water should be first
" Cleans'd and Sanctified by the Priest; that by
" his Baptism, the Sins of the Baptiz'd Person may
" be wash'd away." In his Epistle to Stephen Bishop of Rome, he acquaints him, † That he and his Colleagues, in Council Decreed, "by Common
" Consent and Authority, That if any Presbyters or
" Deacons, who were first Ordained in the Catholick
" Church, and afterwards rebelled and stood out against
" Her; or, If any who were, among Hereticks, Ordain'd
" by the profane Ordination of False Bishops, &c. —
" If any of these return'd to the Church, they should
" be receiv'd to Communion only as Lay-men." In his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, he affirms, That

* Oportet ergo mundari & Sanctificari Aquam prius à Sacerdote, ut possit Baptismo suo peccata Hominis qui Baptizatur, abluere. *Epist.* 70. *Paris*, 1548. *Pag.* 137.

† Addimus plane & Adjungimus Frater charissime *Consensu & Auctoritate Communi*, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri, aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerint, & postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint, vel apud Hæreticos à pseudo-Episcopis & antichristis contra Christi dispositionem, profana Ordinatione promoti sint & contra Altare unum atque Divinum Sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sunt, eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut *Communicent Laici*, &c. — nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos Ordinationis & Honoris Arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverint. *Epist.* 72. *p.* 141, 142.

“ ** None have Authority to Baptize, or give Remis-
 “ sion of Sins, but the **Bishops**, and those who are
 “ founded in the Evangelical Law, and **our Lord's**
 “ **Appointment**; and, That nothing can be Bound
 “ or Loosed out of the Church, seeing there is None
 “ there who has the **Power** of Binding and Loosing.
 “ — That this is founded upon the Authority of
 “ the Holy Scriptures. — That No One can
 “ usurp to himself, in Opposition to the Bishops and
 “ Priests, what he has **no Right and Power**
 “ to perform; and instances the Examples of Corah,
 “ Dathan, and Abiram's endeavouring to usurp to
 “ themselves the Power of Sacrificing, in Opposition
 “ to Moses, and Aaron the Priest. So again, in
 his Epistle to Magnus, speaking of the Baptism
 given by Hereticks and Schismatics, he calls it,
 * a Profane Washing; and gives this for a Reason,
 why those who come over from them to the Church,
 ought to be Baptiz'd in the Church: † “ We say,
 “ (says he) That all Hereticks and Schismatics are
 “ utterly destitute of all **Power** and Right: ” In
 Consequence of this, he calls their Altars, || False
 Altars; their Priesthood, Unlawful; and their Sa-

** Intelligimus, non nisi in Ecclesia Præpositis, & in Evangelica
 Lege, ac Dominica Ordinatio, ne fundatis licere Baptizare, re-
 missam peccatorum dare, foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse
 nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aliquid, aut solvere.
 Nec hoc frater charissime sine Scripturæ divinæ auctoritate pro-
 ponimus, ut dicamus certa Lege, — cuncta esse disposita; nec
 posse quenquam contra Episcopos & Sacerdotes usurpare sibi
 aliquid, quod non sit sui Juris & potestatis. Nam & Chore, Da-
 tham, & Abyron, &c. Epist. 73. p. 145.

* Prophanum Lavacrum.

† Dicimus omnes omnino Hæreticos & Schismaticos nihil ha-
 bere Potestatis ac Juris.

|| Falsa Altaria, & illicita Sacerdotia, & Sacrificia Sacrilega,
 & nomina adulterata fingentes.

crifices,

crifices, *Sacrilegious*. He affirms, That * *they vainly Contend, [who say, That] "any one can be Baptiz'd and Sanctified with Saving Baptism, where 'tis manifest that the Baptizer has not Authority or Commission to Baptize."* And he asks, † *"How can they Justifie and Sanctifie the Baptiz'd, who are the Priest's Enemies, and endeavour to usurp to themselves things unfit and unlawful for them, and which were never granted them by any Law or Authority whatsoever?"*

These, among many other Instances that might be brought from St. Cyprian's own Works, do plainly show, That he esteem'd it necessary that the Baptismal Water should be Sanctified by the **Priest**; That Hereticks and Schismatics were, in his Opinion, but as *Lay-men*; That they had no **Power, Authority or Right** to Baptize; and that, because they had not this Right or Authority, therefore their Baptisms were Null and Void. Whether those Hereticks and Schismatics were rightly judg'd by him to be but *Lay-men*, is another Question; but this is certain, that St. Cyprian esteem'd their Baptisms to be Invalid, for want of Commission and Authority to Baptize; and thereby plainly shew'd, that he esteem'd the Commission to be Essential to the Ministration of Baptism; and consequently, that a supposititious Baptism, by a Person who never had a Commission to Baptize, [which is the very Case of our Lay-

* Frustra Contendunt Baptizari & Sanctificari illic aliquem salutari Baptismo posse, ubi constet Baptizantem Baptizandi Licentiam non habere. —

† Quomodo tales justificare & sanctificare Baptizatos possunt; qui Hostes Sacerdotum, aliena & illicita & nullo sibi Jure concessa usurpare conantur? — *Epist. 76. p. 167, 170, 171.*

Baptisms] must be Null and Void, whatever became of Baptisms by Hereticks and Schismatics who in those Days used to be Ordain'd by Bishops.

§ XIV. *Firmilian* was also of the same mind; for, in his Epistle to *St. Cyprian*, he affirms of Hereticks who have cut themselves off from the Church; That * “ *They can have nothing of Grace,*
 “ *or Power, [or Authority;] since all Grace and*
 “ *Authority is establish'd in the Church, where the*
 “ *Bishops preside, who have the Power or Authority*
 “ *of Baptizing, of Laying on of Hands, and of Ordina-*
 “ *tion. For as an Heretick has not the Authority*
 “ *of Ordaining, or of Laying on of Hands, so neither*
 “ *has he the Power or Authority of Baptizing. —*
 He says, † “ *That this was long before Establish'd*
 “ *and Confirm'd in a Council at Iconium, held by*
 “ *him and the Bishops of Galatia and Cilicia, and*
 “ *the rest of the neighbouring Regions, firmly to*
 “ *be held and maintain'd against Hereticks, when*
 “ *any Doubt should arise about this Matter. —*
 They Decreed, || “ *That all those should be holden*

* *Hæretici si se ab Ecclesia Dei Sciderint, nihil habere Potestatis aut Gratia possunt, quando omnis Potestas & Gratia in Ecclesia Constituta sit; ubi præsident majores natu qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi, & ordinandi possident potestatem. Hæretico enim sicut Ordinare non licet, nec Manum imponere, ita nec Baptizare. — Firmiliani Epist. inter Epist. Cypr. LXXV. p. 159.*

† *Quod totum nos jampridem in Iconio, collecti in unum convenientibus ex Galatia & Cilicia, & cæteris proximis Regionibus confirmavimus, tenendum, contra Hæreticos firmiter & vindicandum, cum à quibusdam de ista re dubitaretur. p. 160.*

|| *Nos etiam illos quos hi qui prius in Ecclesia Catholica Episcopi fuerant, & postmodum sibi potestatem Clericæ Ordinationis assumptes Baptizaverant, pro non Baptizatis habendos judicavimus, &c. p. 165.*

“ as not Baptiz’d, who were Baptiz’d by such as
 “ had once been Bishops in the Catholick Church, if
 “ they were Baptiz’d by them after they had sepa-
 “ rated from the Church, and assum’d to themselves
 “ the Power of the Priestly Order.”

All which Passages of Firmilian’s Letter to St. Cyprian do abundantly prove, that he and his Colleagues, Assembled in the Council of Iconium, were entirely of St. Cyprian’s Opinion, That there was no Baptism, where there was no Priestly Power to Baptize ; and consequently, that Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not having this Priestly Power, is Null and Void ; whatever becomes of that other Question, Whether the then Hereticks and Schismatics were or were not, in reality, reduc’d to the State and Condition of meer Lay-men.

§XV. So again, several of St. Cyprian’s Colleagues in the Council of Carthage, consisting of 87 Bishops, expressly affirm’d the same thing : Thus Novatus à Thamugade says, That * “ According to the De-
 “ cree of their Colleagues, Men of most sacred Me-
 “ mory, all Hereticks and Schismatics ——— who
 seem to have been Ordain’d, should, upon their Con-
 version to the Church, be receiv’d among Laicks.

Confessor Pomponius à Dionysiana says, † “ ’Tis
 “ manifest, that Hereticks cannot Baptize, and

* Secundum Decretum Collegarum nostrorum sanctissimæ memoriæ virorum, omnes Schismaticos & Hæreticos qui ad Ecclesiam conversi sunt, — & qui Ordinati videbantur inter Laicos recipi. *Concil Carthag. inter S. Cypr. Oper. p. 354.*

† Manifestum est Hæreticos non posse Baptizare, & Remissionem Peccatorum dare, qui potestatem non habent, ut aut solvere aut ligare aliquid in terris possint. *P. 360.*

“ give Remission of Sins, who have not the **Power**
 “ of Binding or Loosing any thing on the Earth.

Confessor *Clarus à Mascula* affirms, That
 * “ Hereticks, who have **no Power** out of the
 “ Church, ——— cannot Baptize any one with their
 “ Baptism.”

In Consequence of this Supposition, That Hereticks were destitute of *Power* and *Authority* to Baptize, [as Lay-men, Persons who were never Commission'd, most certainly are,] these Fathers determin'd, That those who were Baptiz'd only by such Hereticks, should, upon their Conversion, be Baptiz'd in the Church: It matters not, whether those Hereticks were utterly destitute of all Power to Baptize, or no: We plainly see, that *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleagues, grounded the Invalidity of their Baptisms, upon their supposed want of Power and Authority; which is an undeniable Proof, that 'twas their Opinion, That if there was in reality *no Commission*, there certainly could be *no Baptism*; which is the very Case about which we are now Disputing: For our Lay-Baptisms are notoriously such, as are perform'd by Persons who never receiv'd, and therefore have not any Commission, Power, or Authority to Baptize; and consequently, according to *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleague Bishops, Assembled in the Councils of *Iconium* and *Carthage*, these Baptisms being without Commission, Power, or Authority, are wholly Null and Void.

* Hæretici qui nec potestatem foris, nec Ecclesiam Christi habent, neminem Baptizare Baptismo ejus possunt. P. 363.

§ XVI. The Canons call'd Apostolical are very ancient; and Three of them, wherein the Baptism of Hereticks is rejected, are suppos'd * by the Learned *Du Pin*, to be the very Canons of the Synods of *Iconium* & *Synnada*, and therefore at least as early as the Year of Christ 255, or 256. — One of these Three, which is the 47th of the Apostolick Canons, is this: “ † *If a Bishop or Presbyter do again Baptize* “ *one, who has really receiv'd Baptism before;*” or, “ *if he do not Baptize one that has been polluted by* “ *Wicked Men, let him be depos'd as one who con-* “ *temns the Cross and Death of Christ, and makes* “ *no Distinction between Priests, and counter-* “ *feit Priests.*”

The Fathers who made this Canon, reckon'd that a Man *was polluted*, when he was pretendedly Baptiz'd by the *Wicked Men* here spoken of; who those *Wicked Men* were, the Conclusion of the Canon determines, namely, *counterfeit or false Priests*; Persons whom that Council reckon'd to be *no Priests*, at the time of their suppos'd pretended Ministration; for they are spoken of, by way of Opposition to *Priests* simply consider'd: So that by this Canon, if a Person had been only Baptiz'd by one, who was but a *counterfeit Priest*, a Bishop, or Presbyter, was to be depos'd, if he did not Baptize that Person; and the Reason why he was to be depos'd, was this, because he made *no*

* *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. 1. p. 14. Lond.*

† *Episcopus vel Presbyter eum qui vere habet Baptisma si de integro Baptizaverit, vel si eum qui ab impiis pollutus est, non Baptizaverit, deponatur, ut qui irrideat Crucem Domini, & Mortem, & non Decernat Sacerdotes, a falsis Sacerdotibus. Can. SS. Apof. XLVII.*

Distinction between Priests and Pretenders; between those who were really vested with Priestly Power, and others, who in those Days, and by those Fathers, were accounted to have no such Power, and therefore only to have before **polluted**, and not Baptiz'd the Person; which comes fully up to our present Case. Our Lay-Baptizers, namely, our Dissenting Teachers, being but Pretenders only, false and counterfeit Priests, having no more actual Power of Priesthood than the meanest Mechanick Laick in the World has.

§ XVII. Mr. Bingham's Second Instance of Laymen's being allow'd to Baptize in Cases of Necessity, is about one hundred Years after his First; and he takes it from the *Spanish Council of Eliberis*, held by 19 Bishops, said to have been assembled about the Year of Christ 305. Canon 38. "*They there appointed (says he, pag. 27.) that when Men were upon a Voyage at Sea, or in any Place where no Church was at hand, if a Catechumen happen'd to be extremely Sick, and at the Point of Death, that then any Christian, who had his own Baptism entire, and was no Bigamist, might Baptize him.*" Upon which our Reverend Historian Remarks, That "*This Authority was not given to all Christians in all Cases, but with several Limitations and Restrictions. 1st, It must be a Case of absolute Necessity when Baptism could not otherwise be had. 2dly, The Person Baptizing must have his own Baptism entire. 3dly, He must be no Bigamist.*"— And upon the whole, Mr. Bingham affirms, That "*in the main, the Matter is indisputable, that they [i.e. the Spanish Bishops of that Council] plainly intended in some extraordinary Cases to give Laymen a License and Authority to administer Baptism,*"

“ *tism, which could not then be said to be unautho-*
 “ *rized in Spain, since it had the best Authority the*
 “ *Church could give it; which is the Determination*
 “ *and Authority of a Council,*” pag. 27, 28. In all
 which there are several Things worth Obser-
 vation.

1st, That Mr. Bingham reckons this Council gave
Authority to some Lay-men to Baptize in extraor-
 dinary Cases: How the Doctor at *Greenwich* will like
 this, who affirms, that such a Supposition exposes
 the Christian Priesthood to new Dangers, I know
 not; but it may be, he will have a more favourable
 Opinion of this Notion, now 'tis espous'd by our
 Reverend Historian, for whose *Historical History* I
 am inform'd he has a mighty Value and Esteem:—
 But if the Council of *Eliberis* intended to give a
Real Authority to some, and not to all Lay-men to
 Baptize, then 'twill follow,

2^{dly}, That this Canon is not **Declarative** of
 any Right in Lay-Christians *as such*, to give Bap-
 tism in Cases of Extremity, but rather the con-
 trary, that they have no such Right in themselves,
 because the Bishops gave *them Authority*, according
 to our Historian; which those *Spanish* Bishops could
 not be said to have done, if Lay-men had *such*
Authority before: And this also is therefore de-
 structive of *Tertullian's* Notion of Lay-men's having
 a Right in themselves to Baptize in the Absence of
 the Clergy. For the Councils intending to Autho-
 rize **some Lay-men** (according to Mr. Bingham)
 and **not others**, to Baptize in such Cases, is an
 Evidence, that those Bishops did not Esteem *all*
Lay-Christians as such, to have that Power and Au-
 thority. Hence it follows,

3^{dly}, That this Canon is a good Argument
 against Mr. Bingham's Supposition, in pag. 11, 12.—
 where

where he guesses that the Antients might Esteem some irregular Baptisms to be *valid*, upon this Principle, “*That Baptism, by whomsoever Christian perform’d, was valid, and not to be repeated*: For, if the Bishops of this Council had known of any such Principle, what need had they to make a Canon to *give Authority* to some Sort of Lay-Christians to Baptize, *if all Christians*, as such, had that Authority in themselves; and Baptism, by *whomsoever Christian* administred, was then good and valid, in the Opinion of the Catholick Church?

There was another Condition impos’d on those Baptizers, by the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council, which Mr. Bingham has not taken notice of, and ’twas this; “*That * if the Baptized survived, he who Baptiz’d him, was obliged to present him to the Bishop to be Confirm’d by Imposition of Hands*:” Which taken in Conjunction with Mr. Bingham’s other Observation, that the Baptizer *was to have his own Baptism entire*; (which, by many Learned Men, is suppos’d to signifie, that he was to be one who had not forfeited the Benefits of his Baptism by lapsing, or falling into such Sins as had brought him under Penance for them, as *Du Pin* upon this Canon has observ’d; and Mr. Bingham himself, *pag. 28. from Albaspiny*;) plainly shews, that the Baptizer was to be one in Communion with his Bishop: He was to be *no Separatist* from the Church; no Schismatical render of her Sacred Body; no Rebel against Episcopacy it self; but one in actual Communion with the Church; one who own’d and acknowledg’d the Spiritual Power of Bishops; and that so far, as to bring the Bap-

* Ita ut si supervixerit, ad Episcopum eum perducatur, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit, Concil. Eliber. Can. XXXVIII.

tiz'd to be Confirm'd by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands. But our Lay-Baptizers are not so; and therefore nothing in Favour of their pretended Baptisms can be pleaded from this Canon, if it were of any Obligation in our Church, as it most certainly is not.

Mr. Bingham is pleas'd to tell us, That "*It will not here be material for any One to Object, That this was but the Determination of a Private National Council; for (says he) we are not now enquiring what Obligation any other Church is under to follow this Rule, but only what was Matter of Fact, and the Practice of the Ancient Church,*" pag. 29. But, with Submission, this Objection is *very material*, and for this Reason, because, we are enquiring, not into the Practice of *a particular Church or two*, but of the ancient Catholick Church, that we may be able to distinguish *singular unwarranted* Notions, from *truly ancient and well-grounded Catholick Traditions and Practices*. This Council was but Provincial; it says nothing about any former Catholick Tradition or Practice; it speaks of *no general Custom* then in Use about this Matter, at the time of 'its Session; it was never receiv'd into the Code of the Catholick Church, as consonant to the Sense of the Catholick Church; and therefore has nothing in it of sufficient weight to convince us, that this Canon is a Testimony of the General Practice of the Church in those Days. We must have more than one single Provincial Council to shew us the General Practice of the Ancient Church: And after all, even if this had been a General Council, it would not have determin'd, that all Lay-Christians, as such, have in themselves a Right to Baptize, in Cases of Extremity; nay, it would not have so much

much as *Authoriz'd* or *Impower'd* all *Baptiz'd* *Lay-men* for that Purpose, because it do's not *Authorize* *Bigamists*; much less would it have *Authoriz'd* *Schismatics*, who separate from their *Bishop's* *Communion*: And therefore, the pretended *Baptism*, given by *Persons* who never were at all *Commission'd* to *Baptize*, and who attempt to give *Baptism Ordinarily*, without the least appearance of *Necessity*, and this even in *Opposition* to, not only some particular *Bishops*, but the *Divine Right* of *Episcopacy* it self; I say, such pretended *Baptisms* would not have had the least *Countenance* from this *Council*, if it had been a *General One*; and therefore, certainly, since 'twas but a *Provincial one*, those spurious *Baptisms*, can upon no account whatsoever, be favour'd by the *Canon* of that *Spanish Council*, even if *Bishops* could, by a *Canon* in *Council*, *Authorize* or *Impower* their own *Lay-Communicants* to *Baptize*, which, it has not yet been prov'd that *Bishops* can do; and I do not trouble my self to enquire whether they can or cannot; it being foreign to the present *Controversy*, which relates to those who were never at all suppos'd to have been *Authoriz'd* by *Bishops*.

§ XVIII. The Reverend Historian's Third Instance, is taken from the Story of Boys Baptizing in Play at the Sea-side, in the days of *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*; and he introduces it thus:
 "Whilst this Matter [of the *Spanish Bishops* in the Council of *Eliberis*, their making a Canon to *Authorize* some of their *Lay-men* to *Baptize*, &c.]
 "was thus determin'd in the West, there happen'd
 "another famous Transaction in the East, which
 "drew on a like Determination in the Church
 "of *Alexandria*, if we may give credit to any of the
 "ancient

“ ancient Historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Rufin,
 “ who all Relate it : Rufin (says he) had the
 “ Story from the Mouth of those who liv'd and con-
 “ vers'd with Athanasius; and the Account of it,
 “ according to his Relation, is this: Alexander, Bi-
 “ shop of Alexandria, on a certain Day, being the
 “ Festival of Peter the Martyr, after the Solemn Ser-
 “ vice of the Church was over, was entertaining
 “ himself with a Prospect toward the Sea, whilst he
 “ expected his Clergy to come and dine with him. In
 “ his Prospect, at some distance upon the Sea-shore,
 “ he beheld a Number of Youths at Play, acting the
 “ Part of a Bishop, and doing all things which were
 “ used to be done in the Church: And viewing them
 “ intently for some time, he at last saw them come
 “ to the Secret and Mystical Rites of Religion,
 “ upon which, being somewhat perplex'd, he sent
 “ immediately for his Clergy, and shew'd them what he
 “ himself had seen, ordering them withal to go, and
 “ bring the Boys before him. Who being ask'd, What
 “ Play they were at, and what they had done, and
 “ after what manner? They at first deny'd all the whole
 “ Matter, as Children us'd to do through fear; but
 “ afterward, they told every thing in order as it was
 “ done, confessing, that they had Baptiz'd certain
 “ Catechumens, by the Hands of Athanasius, who
 “ acted the Part of the Bishop in the Play. Then ex-
 “ amining farther of those who were said to be Bap-
 “ tiz'd, What Questions they were ask'd, and what
 “ Answers they made? And being likewise inform'd
 “ by him who had been the chief Actor; when he found
 “ that all things had been done according to the Rites
 “ of our Religion, after he had conferr'd with a
 “ Council of his Clergy, he is said to have deter-
 “ min'd, [Statuisse traditur, says Rufin,] That
 “ the Baptism of those, on whom Water had been
 pour'd,

“ pour’d, with the proper Interrogatories and Re-
 “ sponses, ought not to be repeated, but only have
 “ those things added, which the Priests were used to
 “ perform. * Socrates, and † Sozomen, have the
 “ same Story; and the Author of the Life of Atha-
 “ nadius in Photius, with Johannes Moschus, and
 “ many others,” says Mr. Bingham, pag. 29, 30, 31.
 Then he Names “ Archbishop Whitgift, Abbot, Co-
 “ tolerius, Pagi, and, he says, many others that
 “ might be nam’d, Men of Character in their Age,
 “ have appear’d in its Behalf, and defended it as a
 “ genuine Piece of History. And it is some Confir-
 “ mation, that Rufin says he had it from the Mouth
 “ of those who convers’d with Athanasius. And Ni-
 “ cephorus Calistus, who also relates the Story, ||
 “ gives a parallel Instance of another Fact much like
 “ this, which happened in his own time at Constanti-
 “ nople,” pag. 31. Thus far Mr. Bingham. It is a
 wonderful Thing to see with what Air of Gravity,
 and Solemnity of Expression, this Reverend Histo-
 rian introduces the Story of this ludicrous, sportive
 Washing: He says of it, “ There happen’d ano-
 “ ther famous Transaction in the East.” This,
 before one comes to read the Story it self, looks as
 if it was some mighty important Affair which was
 of a very Publick Nature, and undoubtedly attested
 to by the Bishops of the Eastern Church; for, he
 says, it “ drew on a like Determination in the
 “ Church of Alexandria,” i. e. a like Determina-
 tion to that of the Council of Eliberis, he was
 just before speaking of. Now who is there, that at
 first reading of this, would not naturally expect

* Hist. Lib. 1. cap. 15.

† Lib. 2. cap. 17.

|| Niceph. Hist. Lib. 3. c. 37.

to find, that a *Provincial Council* of Bishops was assembled at *Alexandria*, upon the Account of this pretended "*famous Transaction*," and that they had made some new Canon, as the Council of *Eliberis* did, about Lay-Baptism? For, he says, it "*drew on a like Determination*;" when, behold, *parturiunt montes, &c.* a Mountain has brought forth a Mouse. This *famous Transaction* was nothing but Boys Play, in the East, *i. e.* at the Water-side near *Alexandria*; and the *Determination* it is said to have drew on, was no more than this, That the Bishop of *Alexandria*, (having taken Council with the Priests that were about him, whom he was before expecting to Dine with him) is said to have determin'd, that the Boys Baptiz'd in Play, should not be Baptiz'd again: A *famous Transaction* this! and as important a Determination too! If it had been true in fact, which we have no reason to believe it was, if we consider, 1st, The Ecclesiastical Writers whom Mr. Bingham appeals to for the Truth thereof. 2^{dly}, Its little or no Credit among Learned Men. And 3^{dly}, The Circumstances of the Story itself. For,

First, The known Person, from whom we originally have this Story, is no other than *Rufinus*; and from him *Sozomen* alone, among the ancient Ecclesiastical Historians. The First, a Man remarkably credulous, and besides so very careless in his Ecclesiastical History, that *Socrates Scholasticus* complains of it, * and says, That he "*has err'd concerning the Notation of the Times*:" And gives one Instance thereof in the Troubles of *St. Athanasius*; That "*he was also ignorant of*

* *Socrates Eccles. Hist. Book ii. cap. i.*

“ *St. Athanasius’s Banishment into the Gallias, and*
“ *of several other things.*” That *Socrates* “ *ha-*
“ *ving at first followed Rufinus, [as his Author]*
“ *wrote the First and Second Book of his [i. e. So-*
“ *crates’s] History according to his [i. e. Rufinus’s]*
“ *Authority*” — “ *But [says Socrates] when we*
“ *had afterwards procur’d Athanasius’s Books, where-*
“ *in he laments his own calamitous Sufferings, &c.—*
“ *we thought it more expedient to Credit him (which*
“ *had suffer’d these Hardships) and those who had*
“ *been present at the transacting of these Matters,*
“ *rather than such as have followed Conjectures*
“ *in their Relations thereof, and for that Reason have*
“ *been mistaken.*” Besides, “ *having got several*
“ *Letters of Persons at that time, very Eminent,*
“ *to our utmost Ability, we have diligently traced*
“ *out the Truth. Upon which Account, we have*
“ *been necessitated entirely to dictate again the First*
“ *and Second Book of this Work [i. e. Socrates’s*
“ *Ecclesiastical History] making use nevertheless of*
“ *those Passages, in the Relation whereof Rufinus*
“ *hath not forsaken the Truth.*” By all which
’tis plain, that the Credulity of *Rufinus*, his Care-
lessness, his following Conjectures, and his deviating
from, and forsaking of *Truth*, in some Matters of
his Ecclesiastical History, were the Reasons which
induc’d *Socrates* to write over a-new, the First and
Second Books of his History, which he at first took
from *Rufinus*; whose Authority he afterwards
found was not to be depended upon in many
Cases, when he had consulted more Authentick
Records: And why we should depend upon *Rufinus’s*
History, concerning this ludicrous Baptism, when
the Judicious *Socrates Scholasticus* found *Rufinus* to
be so apt to follow Conjectures, and to depart from
Truth, that he refus’d to Copy this Story from him,

as I shall by and by prove ; I say, why we should believe *Rufinus*, when an ancient *competent* Judge of such Matters, who knew his Errors in History better than we, did not believe him in this Matter, is hard to understand ; especially, when we find, that even the Moderns have discover'd *Rufinus* to have been so careless and negligent in Writing, as that “ *he* * *seems to have compos'd his Two Books of*
“ *Ecclesiastical History, without looking into any Re-*
“ *cords. He translated Eusebius's † Ecclesiastical*
“ *History with great Liberty ; he added thereto a Re-*
“ *lation of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus his Miracles,*
“ *and an Harangue of Lucian the Martyr, which*
“ *are not in Eusebius.—There are several Faults in*
“ *his Translation : He makes Zacharias, spoken of in*
“ *St. Luke, to have been a Martyr at Lyons ; he*
“ *confounds St. Biblias with Blandina, &c.*” Thus he deals with another Man's Works. And as for his own, “ *There are many Historical Faults in his*
“ *History. These are some ; He supposes that Atha-*
“ *nasius hid himself for six Years after he was con-*
“ *demn'd by the Council of Tyre : He perverts the*
“ *Order of Time in the History of St. Athanasius.—*
“ *He says, that St. Hilary was Excommunicated,*
“ *which is false : And he confounds the Time,*
“ *when he says, that St. Hilary was Banish'd after*
“ *the Council of Milan, &c.*” And thus we see what a correct and careful Historian *Rufinus* was!

As for *Sozomen's* Account of this Story, he took it from *Rufinus* ; and therefore is no additional Evi-

* *Valesius concerning the Life and Writings of Socrates and Sozomen, prefix'd to their Ecclesiastical History.*

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. V. p. 108. Notes (b) and (l) Lond.*

dence for the Truth of it, so that it still stands *only* upon the first Foundation which *Rufinus* laid; and what that is, will be something more discover'd, by what I have farther to say concerning *Socrates Scholasticus*: In the mean time, we have no more reason to regard this Story, for *Sozomen's* having transcrib'd it from *Rufinus*, than we have to esteem other *Trivial* and *Childish* Passages which are found to occur in several Places of *Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History*, and which he might probably have taken from other Writers who follow'd *Conjectures*, in their Relations, and for that reason were often mistaken; of this sort, of Trifling and Childishness, is, * "*his Digression, in his 1st Book, concerning the Building of the City Hemona; and concerning the Argonauts Carrying the Ship Argo on their Shoulders some Furlongs; also his Description of Daphne without the Walls of the City Antioch, which occurs at Chap. 19th of his 6th Book; and that Observation of his, concerning the Beauty of the Body, where he treats of that Virgin with whom the blessed Athanasius Absconded a long while.*" All which, betray what Judgment he had, as an Historian, and make him to be less valuable, in that respect, than *Socrates Scholasticus* was.

For this latter, in collecting his *Ecclesiastical History*, has † "*made use of a singular Judiciousness and Diligence: His Judiciousness is manifested, by his Remarks and Sentiments interwoven every-where throughout his Books.*" —
 "He judges incomparably well, both of Men, and and also of Ecclesiastical Business and Affairs.
 "There is nothing in him but what is Grave and

* Valesius, of the Life and Writings of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.

† Ibid.

“ **Serious** ; nothing that you can expunge, as
 “ *Superfluous* ; but, on the contrary, some Passages
 “ occur in Sozomen, that are Trivial and Childish.
 “ Socrates’s Diligence is declar’d by many — In-
 “ stances ; chiefly by this, in regard he frequently
 “ annexes a Note of the Times, that is, the Consu-
 “ lates and Olympiads, especially where he mentions
 “ such Matters as are more momentous. Nor has
 “ he Carelessly or Negligently written his History, as
 “ Rufinus did, who (as has been observ’d before)
 “ seems — to have compos’d his Two Books of Ec-
 “ clesiastical History — without looking into any
 “ Records. Our Socrates did far otherwise ; for
 “ having from all Places got together the Best Monu-
 “ ments, that is, the Epistles of Prelates, the Acts
 “ of Synods, and the Books of Ecclesiastical Writers,
 “ agreeable to their Authority, he compos’d his
 “ History. This Diligent and Judicious Eccle-
 siastical Historian is brought in by Mr. Bingham,
 to vouch for the Truth of Rufinus’s Story, of
 Mr. Bingham’s **Famous Transaction**, of Baptism
 by Boys at Play at the Water-side ; Mr. Bingham
 names Socrates no less than twice, as an ancient
 Historian who may challenge our Belief of this
 Story ; for he says, before the beginning of it,
 That “ There happen’d a Famous, &c. which drew
 “ on a Determination, &c. — if we may give
 “ credit to any of the Ancient Historians, So-
 “ crates, &c. who all Relate it,” pag. 29 : And
 then, after the Conclusion of this Story, he says,
 “ Socrates, &c. have the same Story,” pag. 31. and
 is so particular, as to refer us to Socrates’s Eccle-
 siastical History, Book 1. Chap. 15. For my part,
 I am confounded at Mr. Bingham’s Positiveness in
 this Assertion, and wonder at the Greatness of his
 Mistake in so plain a Matter, (if it be indeed a

Mistake in a Man so much conversant in Ecclesiastical Writers as Mr. Bingham is.) However, I will not aggravate this Slip, lest I should thereby make myself guilty of too severe a Censure: But this I am certain of, that

Socrates Scholasticus says not one word of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing other Boys; nor of *Alexander* the Bishop's determining, that those *suppos'd* Baptiz'd Children ought not to be Baptiz'd again. I say, *Socrates* has not one word of this in all his History: And that the Reader may see that I do not wrong Mr. Bingham, I will here transcribe from the 15th Chapter of the 1st Book of *Socrates's Ecclesiastical History*, all that he relates concerning *Athanasius's* Play at the Water-side, and of the Notice which Bishop *Alexander* took of it; and 'tis this: "Upon the Death of Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, Athanasius was promoted to the Presidency over that Church. Rufinus relates, That this Person, when he was very young, did, together with those that were his equals in Age, play at a kind of an Holy Sport; this Play was an Imitation of the Sacerdotal Function, and of those Persons Order that were Clergy-men; in this Sport, therefore, Athanasius was elected Bishop, and every one of the rest of the Children acted either a Presbyter or a Deacon. This Sport the Children play'd at, on that Day whereon was celebrated the Memory of Peter the Martyr and Bishop. Alexander Bishop of Alexandria accidentally passing by at that time, saw all their Play; and having afterwards sent for the Children, he enquired of them, what Place had been allotted to every one of them in the Play, supposing, that from what had been done, something might be portended [concerning each of them;] and he gave Order, that

“ *that the Children should be educated in the Church,*
 “ *and instructed in Learning, but most especially*
 “ *Athanasius. Afterwards, when he was come to*
 “ *a maturity of Age, he Ordain'd him Deacon, and*
 “ *took him along with him to Nice, that he might*
 “ *assist him in the Disputations there, at such time*
 “ *as that Synod was Convened. These Things Ru-*
 “ *finus has related concerning Athanasius, in his*
 “ *Books [of Ecclesiastical History ;] nor is it at all*
 “ *unlikely that these things happen'd, for many such-*
 “ *like Acts are frequently found to have been done.*
 “ *Thus much we have hitherto said concerning*
 “ *Athanasius.*

Thus far *Socrates*, and he has nothing more relating to this Matter : So that we may plainly see what part of *Rufinus's* Story he had reason to believe, and hand down to Posterity, and what part he reckon'd not to be agreeable to Truth ; he says, in his * *History*, That he “ *makes use of those*
 “ *Passages, in the Relation whereof Rufinus hath*
 “ **not forsaken the Truth ;**” plainly intimating, that *Rufinus*, in some Passages of his *Ecclesiastical History*, had forsaken the Truth, and that he would not make use of any such his false Passages ; and therefore, in his Transcripts from *Rufinus*, what *Socrates* omits in his *History*, which *Rufinus* relates in his, may be look'd upon as false, or at least not well attested, in the Opinion of our judicious *Socrates* ; and since *Socrates* has wholly omitted the Story of *Athanasius's* Baptizing the Boys in Play, and also of *Alexander's* determining, that they ought not to have their Baptism repeated, 'tis a sign that he reckon'd this part of the Story to be

* Book 2. Cap. 1.

one Instance of *Rufinus's* forsaking the Truth, and consequently, that he did not believe it, and so would not stuff his History with such an odd improbable Relation.

The Author of the Life of *St. Athanasius*, (another of *Mr. Bingham's* Historians) in *Photius*, is an unknown Writer. *Photius* does not so much as guess who he was; and therefore, tho' he has the same Story, yet being an unknown Author, his Evidence is of no weight in this Matter, especially if we consider, that he is so singular in one part of this Story, as to reckon, that what the Children did in their Play, was done by **Divine * Instinct or Inspiration**. A very extraordinary Addition this to *Rufinus's* first Story, and which betrays the *Credulity* of this unknown Author, whoever he was: Besides, if what he says be true, it will follow, that this Baptism was Authoriz'd and Commission'd by God himself, being done by a *Divine Instinct*, and so spoils *Mr. Bingham's* Design in quoting this Story. But this, of a *Divine Instinct* in the Boys, none but those who give credit to idle Fables, will ever believe.

Another of *Mr. Bingham's* supposed Vouchers for the Truth of this Story, is *Johannes Moschus*, pag. 31. But sure our Reverend Historian is hard put to it for good Evidence, when he stoops so low, as to make use of such ridiculous Authors as this Monk, who, in that very Book which *Mr. Bingham* quotes, [viz. *Moschus Pratum Spir.*] "relates
" many strange Stories and Miracles that deserve little
" credit, (as *Du Pin* tells us;) for Instance, in his

* Alexander ad se vocat, auditque non illos sacra irrifisse, sed ut ex eventu colligas fecisse Divino quodam Instincto, &c. Photii Biblioth. Cod. 258. pag. 1430.

45th Chapter, he says, "A Recluse promised the
 "Devil, he would adore the Virgin's Image no more,
 "to be delivered from his Temptation, and that he
 "was reprov'd by his Elder for doing so. In the
 47th, he relates, "That the Virgin having Appear'd
 "twice to a Jester uttering impious Speeches against
 "her, and having warn'd him to do so more, but to
 "no purpose, she Appear'd to him the third time,
 "and that having sign'd his Hands and Feet with the
 "Sign of the Cross, he found himself, when he
 "awoke, without Hands and Feet. In the 79th,
 "That a Catholick, being Servant to a Severian,
 "having left with his Master the Key of his Chest,
 "where he had laid up the Eucharist in a Linen-
 "Cloth, the Master having design'd to Burn it, be-
 "cause his Servant did not come back, found that
 "the Particles of the Eucharist had brought forth
 "Ears of Corn. In the 196th Chapter, he re-
 lates, "That some Children of the Province of
 "Apamea would needs represent the Celebration
 "of the Holy Mysteries, and that having chosen one
 "of themselves to perform the Office of a Priest,
 "and two others of Deacons, they set some Bread
 "upon a Stone, and that he that acted the Priest did
 "pronounce the Words of Oblation, which he had
 "gotten by heart. ——— That having thus per-
 "formed all the Ceremonies, before they brake the
 "Bread, to give the Communion, Fire came down
 "from Heaven, which consumed the Oblation, and
 "the whole Stone whereon it was laid. That the
 "Bishop of the Place, hearing of it, built a Mona-
 "stery in that Place, and made all those Children
 "Monks. To this Example, he adds that reported
 "by Rufinus, of the Baptism by St. Athanasius, who
 "was then but a Child, to some other Children. ———
 And in the 207th, "There is mention made of Two
 "Angels

“ Angels who stood Sureties for a Girl which had a
 “ mind to be Baptiz’d.

The same Book is full of an infinite number of Relations and miraculous strange Stories of Apparitions, Revelations, Visions, and Miracles said to be wrought by Hermits, by Fore-telling Things to come, Discovering Mens Thoughts, Commanding Lions and Wild Beasts ; when Dead, speaking to the Living from their Graves ; and such-like fabulous Trumpery : Among those Whims, *Rufinus's* Story is also related. And let the Judicious determine, whether this *Johannes Mosculus*, a Monk of the 7th Century, so foolishly Credulous even to Superstition, can give any Reputation to the Story before us. If this must be our Way to get at the *General Practice* of the Primitive Church, and we resolve to trust to such Legendary Writers as *Johannes Moschus*, we shall soon return again to all the Corruptions of Popery : For, where shall we stop, when we follow such Dreaming, Visionary Guides, as he was ?

Mr. Bingham tells us, That *Nicephorus Calistus* relates the same Story : Upon this, one would have thought, that *Nicephorus* gives us a particular Account of it ; but when we look into his History, there we find, that after he has told a Story of a Jew, Baptized with Sand instead of Water, in a Desert Place where no Water was to be had, and of his being afterwards commanded to be Baptized with Water ; he then adds only this, * “ *Histories say, that something like this happen'd also in the time of the Great Athanasius.*” This is all that *Nicephorus* says.

* *Niceph. Calist. Eccles. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 37. Paris 1630.*
 Simile quiddam accidisse etiam sub Athanasio magno Historiæ tradunt.

And how can it be affirm'd, that "*Nicephorus Calistus relates the same Story*", when he only says those few Words? And what he says, amounts to no Relation of the Story at all; since nothing of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing his Play-fellows, or of *Alexander's* Determining the Validity of this suppos'd Ludicrous Baptism, can be gather'd from *Nicephorus's* Words, consider'd as they stand in his History, *separate from any other* that was written before him. Indeed, he does immediately add another Story of a Jew Boy, Baptiz'd in Play, by Christian Children, at the Sea-side near *Constantinople*, in his own Days: But then, if we consider that this Writer *Nicephorus Calistus*, a Monk of *Constantinople*, * liv'd and wrote in the 14th Century, that he has mix'd his History with a great many **Fables**, and has fall'n into many **Mistakes**, (as the learned *Du Pin* informs us) 'tis easie to account for *Nicephorus's* relating such Stories as this; and the *easie Credulity* of a *Fabulous Writer* in the 14th Century, is but a *sorry Evidence* for, nay, a *Dis-reputation* to, the Truth of any Tales of this nature. Mr. *Bingham's* referring us to such **Authors**, for the Confirmation of *Rufin's* Story, is no-ways answerable to the Character he has acquir'd among Learned Men; and, for a *Reverend Priest of the Church of England* to referr us to the Authority of such *Fabulous Writers*, as *Johannes Moschus*, and *Nicephorus Calistus*, in the *Dark Ages* of the Church, to convince us of the Truth of an odd whimsical Story, which in its natural Consequences tends to the utter Abolition of the whole Priestly Character, if the Matter thereof be allow'd

* *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. xiv. pag. 87. Lond.*

to be true, just, and right, is a very *astonishing* thing, and the Principle from whence it proceeds hard, if at all, to be accounted for, especially in a Man who doubtless, has given his Assent to the 21st and 22d *Articles of the Church of England*, which warn us against trusting to Mens Mistakes, and ill-grounded fabulous Inventions in *Matters of Religion*.

The Reader, I hope, will charitably censure the *Zeal* of this Reflection, since it proceeds from nothing else but a necessary Indignation, which all good Christians ought to have, against such *fabulous Stories*, as strike at the very Root of our Saviour's Holy Institutions. But 'tis time to proceed.

Secondly, We have no reason to believe that there is any Truth in this part of the Story, since it has so little or no Credit among Learned Men: The Industrious and Judicious Ecclesiastical Historian *Socrates*, a very good Judge, and Competent by reason of his Abilities, the best Monuments he procured from all Places, and the early Days he liv'd in, this Writer, so well qualified, as I have before observed, tho' in his Two first Books he follows *Rufinus* in many things, yet, in his 1st Book, and 15th Chapter, where he Copies one part of the Story from *Rufinus*, he absolutely passes over in silence the other part of it, about the Ludicrous Baptism, and the pretended Determination relating thereto, as not worthy the Notice of himself, or his Reader; which certainly he would not have done, if he had believ'd that it was so *Famous a Transaction* as Mr. Bingham calls it, and if he had found any such Determination of the Bishop and his Clergy about it, as our Reverend Historian talks of; for *Socrates* says of himself, That he makes "*use of such Passages, in the Relation whereof*"

" *Rufinus*

“*Rufinus hath not forsaken the Truth.*” But a Man of *Socrates’s* Judgment and Knowledge was not to be impos’d upon by the single Authority of only one such Writer as *Rufinus*, and therefore, finding no better Authority than his, he does not follow him in this part of his Story, but wholly leaves him, and thereby gives us to understand that he had no reason to believe it, and consequently, that it deserves not the Regard and Esteem of Future Posterity. And we find none of the following Ancient Fathers, or Councils, no, not even *St. Augustin* himself, appeal to this Story, for the Validity of Lay-Baptism; this latter especially, who pleaded for the Validity of Baptism, by *whomsoever* administer’d, In the Name of the Trinity, would doubtless have made use of the Authority of this pretended “*famous Transaction*,” if he had known of it, and believ’d it. If he did not know of it, the Cause must be its *great Obscurity*, and the little, or rather *no notice* which the Church took of it; this argues its *Worthlessness*: If he knew of it, and did not believe it, and so would not appeal to it, ’tis an argument that it had then no established Credit, and might therefore justly be neglected by him.

There is another sort of Men who reject this Story as a Fable, and who cannot be suspected to have any other Motive for so doing, than an impartial love to Truth, and they are some Learned Men of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, whose love to Truth, makes ’em, in some Instances, forget their Partiality for the Corruptions of that Church, and even Despise some Fables, the Belief of which would conduce very much to the seeming Reputation of their Erroneous Practices. This very Story of *Athanasius*, if it were true, would add
very

very much (in some Mens Opinion) to the Reputation of Baptism by Lay-men and Women, taught in that Church: And yet the best Judges, even among them, are not hereby tempted to own this Fable for a Truth, but, on the contrary, they esteem it to be but a Fiction, because they find no Marks of Truth upon it. Mr. Bingham is not so kind to his Reader, as to discover any of these Opposers of that Story; 'twould have spoil'd its Credit if he had, and therefore I shall here produce some of their Testimonies against it. The Learned Du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbon, calls it, * "*A Story — very Improbable,*" and that "*it passes among Learned Men, rather for a Fable than a Truth,*" and gives good Reasons for the Improbability of the Truth of it, which I will shew by and by. The Learned Monks of the *Benedictin* Order tell us also, † That "*it labours under very great Suspicion among Learned Men;*" and these Monks likewise shew Reason why this Story do's not deserve any Credit. And shall the Judiciousness and Impartiality of *Papists*, stand in Competition with the Judgment and Integrity of *Protestants*? Will the *Reform'd* defend a Story, which [if true] favours *Popery*, when *Papists* themselves shew the Improbability of the same Story? God forbid! 'Tis well we have also had the Evidence of those who have Reform'd from *Popery*, such

* Du Pin's *History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, Century IV. p. 28. Lond. 1696.

† Verum hæc Rufini Historia grandi apud eruditos laborat suspitione. *Vita S. Athan. Opera & Studio Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, pag. 3.

as *Spanheim*, our Learned *Dr. Cave*, * as in the Margin, and Others, against it; otherwise, the *Papists* (as Things go at this time of day) might have reproach'd us, for being as great Favourers of *Idle Fables and Stories* to support our own Fancies, as we charge them to be, in the Defence of their Corruptions. But,

Thirdly, The Circumstances of the Story it self are such, as that it deserves not to be credited; for the Time and Place, in which this sportive Baptism, and the Ratification thereof, is said to have happened; viz. in the Time of the Episcopate of *Alexander*, and in the Church of *Alexandria*, betray the unlikelihood of it: For as the Learned *Du Pin* has observ'd, “ 1st, *This Story of Children Baptiz'd*
“ *by Athanasius [in his Childhood] do's not at all*
“ *agree with the Discipline of the Church of Alexan-*
“ *dria upon the Subject of Re-baptization, and 'tis a*
“ *thing unheard of that it should be approv'd of, or*
“ *that any could approve a Baptism of this Nature,*

* Mitto quæ de eo adhuc puero Episcopi personam induente Baptismumque per sacrum quendam Ludum celebrante, vulgo narrant. Fabulam certè esse, & nunc, & olim suspicatus sum. Primus hanc Historiam extulit *Rufinus*, scriptor nimis credulus, quique hæc ex solo auditu refert, ipse à re gestâ integro penè sæculo remotus: Nec leve præjudicium videri debet, rem adeò memorabilem omnes hujus ævi scriptores latuisse, neminemq; ante *Rufinum* de eo vel verbum inaudivisse, neque alia desunt, quæ idem suadeant argumenta, modo his immorari vellem. *Hist. Literaria Autore Guil. Cave S. S. Theol. Profes. Vol. 1. p. 141, 142.*

The whole Evidence is founded upon the single Authority of Rufinus, who 'tis plain was the first Reporter of the Story, a Man infinitely careless in his Accounts of Things, and who took up this, only as a popular Tradition, at near an hundred Years distance from the Thing it self. Cave's Lives of the Primitive Fathers, Vol. 2. p. 72.

† *Du Pin's History of Ecclesiastical Writers, Century IV. p. 28. Note (d.)*

“ as Alexander of Alexandria is suppos’d to have
 “ done. 2dly, It do’s not agree with the Age of
 “ St. Athanasius: For Alexander was not ordain’d
 “ Bishop of Alexandria, according to the Testimony
 “ of St. Jerome, until the Year 321. and St. Athana-
 “ sius, being ordain’d Bishop in 326, was not, in
 “ this Interval, of an Age to play such little Pranks.
 “ And tho’ it were suppos’d, against the Authority
 “ of St. Jerome, that Alexander was ordain’d in 315.
 “ this would not remove the Difficulty; for it cannot
 “ be said, that St. Athanasius play’d at this Sport,
 “ when he was above 10 or 12 Years old; from
 “ whence it would follow, that he was ordain’d Bishop
 “ at the 25th or 27th Year of his Age; which is not
 “ very probable.” Baronius places Alexander in
 that See, either in 310 or 311. and Athanasius in
 the Year 326, 15 or at most 16 Years after; and
 cites Theodoret, l. i. c. 26. and Athanasius himself,
Apol. 2. According to which Account, if the Story
 were true, he must have been a very young Bishop,
 not above 25 or 26 Years old at most, which does
 not agree with the Church’s Discipline in those
 Days: Nor could he possibly have made such a
 Figure in the Council of Nice, convened A.D. 327.
 as he plainly did. *Socrat.* l. i. c. 8. and *Theodoret.*
 l. i. c. 25. See also *G. Naz. Orat.* 21. p. 380, 381.
 Nay, by the Calculation of the Learned *Benedictines*,
 † in their Account of St. Athanasius’s Life, when he
 is said to have play’d at this Sport, he could hardly
 be less than Eighteen Years of Age; and how a
 Youth of those Years, and so solid as Athanasius

† Et si enim per Athanasii ætatem minime repugnaret ejus-
 modi Lusus, quod haud facile tamen concedatur de adolescente,
 cui ex memoratis superius, vix minus duodeviginti annorum tunc
 adscripserimus.

was, could be guilty of such childishness, let any one in his Senses judge. Add to this, that *Alexander* the Bishop (as those Learned || Monks have observ'd) "was not such a Man as would have esteem'd Childrens Sport to be good and valid in so weighty and serious a Matter as this is. 3dly, The very Words of *Rufinus's* Story shew, that he himself could not rely upon it; for notwithstanding, that by way of Preface, he says, he'll relate some few things of *St. Athanasius* as he receiv'd them "from those wholiv'd and convers'd with him:" Yet, when he comes to *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination of not re-baptizing the Children, he seems either not to have receiv'd it from those who were so conversant with *Athanasius*, or else to doubt of the Truth of it; for he do's not say, that *Alexander* determined: No, he does not venture to be so positive; but thus, "He is said to have determined, that the Baptism * ought not to be repeated." The very Language of a Man who tells a Story, the Truth of which he is not sure of, and the Vouchers for which he dare not wholly rely on: And yet, notwithstanding this Uncertainty of *Rufinus* himself, about the great Thing we are searching into, viz. Bishop *Alexander's* Determination, Mr. *Bingham* endeavours to make it pass for a "genuine Piece of History," pag. 31. And indeed, if the Determination it self be not genuine, all the rest of the Story is of no Consideration in this Debate; for what does the Play of Children signifie, be it of what sort soever, so long as the Governours of

|| Non is erat Alexander qui tam seria in re, Ludum puerorum raturum haberet. Vita S. Athan. p. 3.

* Statuisse traditur, illis, &c. iterari Baptismum non debere. *Rufin. Eccles. Hist. ut supra.*

the Church make no grave and serious Determinations about it? Our *Rufinus*, the first Author who publish'd the Story of *Athanasius's* Play, do's not venture to relate *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination as a thing certain; he seems to have some Fears, that such an odd unprecedented Determination, was not very likely to be made by so grave a Bishop; he would not risk his own Reputation so far as to vouch for the Truth of it, but refers us to others for that [and they also are unknown] "*traditur statuisse:*" "He is said to have determin'd" a sorry Proof for "an authentick Piece of History," when the original Historian himself hands it to us in such uncertain, doubtful Terms.

Mr. *Bingham* says, "It is some Confirmation, that *Rufin* says, he had it from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*," pag. 31. But Mr. *Bingham* must prove that *Rufin* says, He had *Alexander's* Determination of not Re-baptizing, from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*. This do's not at all appear; for *Rufin* do's not conclude his whole Story with telling us, that he had all the preceding things from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*: He says nothing like this at the End of his Relation. Before the Beginning thereof indeed, he makes a short Preface to inform his Reader, after he had shew'd that St. *Athanasius* was made Bishop of *Alexandria* upon the Decease of *Alexander*, that he did not think it improper † to repeat some few things concerning the Rise of

† Verum non mihi absque ordine videtur, pauca de hujus viri [Sc. Athanasii] origine suprâ repetere, & cujus à puero institutionis fuerit, sicuti ab his qui cum ipso vitam duxerant accipimus memorare. *Rufini Hist. Eccles. Lib. 1. c. 14.*

St. *Athanasius*, and to mention what sort of Education he had from a Child, as he had receiv'd 'em from those who liv'd and convers'd with him.

Here we see, that what *Rufinus* himself says he receiv'd from them, was no more than a few things concerning St. *Athanasius*'s Rise and Education from a Child: So that Bishop *Alexander*'s suppos'd Determination, of not Baptizing the other Children, having nothing to do with St. *Athanasius*'s Rise and Education, cannot be fairly said to have been receiv'd by *Rufinus*, from those Persons who liv'd and convers'd with him. Mr. *Bingham* should have let his Readers see *Rufinus*'s Preface to the Story, and also his Words towards the Conclusion thereof, that they might have been enabled to pass a right Judgment, what Parts of the Story *Rufinus* refers to, when he says he had them from those who liv'd and convers'd with St. *Athanasius*; for the Conclusion of the Story plainly discovers those few things which he says he had from them, and they are in short these, * “ *That Alexander order'd Athanasius, &c. to be brought up for the Service of the Church; That in a short time after, Athanasius having been sufficiently instructed,—was restor'd by his Parents to the Bishop; That from that time he was like Samuel, brought up in the Temple of*

* Athanasium vero, atque eos quos ludus ille vel Presbyteros habere visus fuerat vel ministros, convocatis parentibus, sub Dei obtestatione tradit Ecclesiæ suæ nutriendos. Parvo autem tempore cum à Notario integrè, & à Grammatico sufficienter Athanasius fuisset instructus, continuò tanquam fidele Domini commendatum, à parentibus restituitur Sacerdoti, ac velut Samuel quidam in templo Domini nutritur, & ab eo pergente ad Patres in senectute bona, ad portandum post se Ephod Sacerdotale deligitur. *Rufin. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. c. 14.*

“the Lord; and that finally upon the Death of Alexander, he was ordained Bishop in his stead.” These are the few things relating to St. *Athanasius*’s Rise and Education, which *Rufinus* says he had from those who were conversant with St. *Athanasius*. And if *Alexander*’s supposititious Determination about not Baptizing the other Boys, can be prov’d to have any necessary dependance on St. *Athanasius*’s Rise and Education, then, it may be allow’d, that *Rufin* says, he receiv’d that also from those who were conversant with St. *Athanasius*: This does not yet appear, but the contrary, by *Rufinus*’s saying of that Determination; only “*traditur statuisse,*” it is said, That he determin’d; using a more doubtful way of speaking here, than he does, when he speaks of the Rise and Education of St. *Athanasius*: Add to this, that *Socrates*, who had St. *Athanasius*’s Books, together with the Assistance of those who also were conversant with him, wholly omits this Passage, tho’ he had *Rufinus*’s History before him, when he transcrib’d some other Parts of the Story from it. This confirms the Remark I made before, that *Rufinus* did not receive that Passage from those who convers’d with St. *Athanasius*; for if he did, why should so judicious an Historian as *Socrates*, discredit it so far as to refuse to Copy it from him?

Mr. Bingham says, “Admit it were a fabulous Report, yet we must charitably believe of the ancient Historians, both Greek and Latin, that they believ’d themselves, at least, what they reported, that such a Fact had happened at Alexandria; and if it had been contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church in their times, they would hardly have related it so plausibly without passing some Censure and Reflection on it:—Which, the ancient

“ *ancient Historians having not done, it may reasonably be concluded, that, at least, they thought the Determination of Alexander and his Council, to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church,*” pag. 31, 32.

But in Answer to this, do's not Mr. Bingham know, that it is a common thing for Historians to transcribe from those who wrote before them, such Transactions as they relate to have happened; and that Writers do often thus follow one another, not because they believe every thing they transcribe, but because they would not have their own Writings to be accus'd, of omitting such Relations, as others took notice of before them in their Histories of the same Time? It is often enough seen, that this is the only Design of *some Historians*, and that they leave their Readers to judge for themselves, whether some of their Relations be true or false, without passing any Censure themselves upon the Things which they relate. But what if ancient Historians did themselves believe, the fabulous Reports they hand down to us? Do's it therefore follow that they thought those Fables to be agreeable to the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church? Where lies the reasonableness of this Consequence; are Historians Thoughts always intent upon, and declaratory of, the Church's Belief and Practice? No such Matter. But it is pleaded, if the Fable “ *had been contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church, they would hardly have related it so plausibly, without passing some Censure and Reflection on it.*” This makes nothing for the Matter; because, what they would *hardly* have done is no Argument, since we find many Writers have overcome this *imaginary Difficulty*: For, the same Superstition, easie Credulity, or Heedlessness, that

makes Men to believe a *Fable*, which is *contrary to Truth*; causes them also to relate without any Censure, such Stories as are even contrary to the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; and doubtless, 'tis from this corrupt Fountain, that several Churches have, in process of time, been overflow'd with Error and Superstition, by first not censuring new Fables that were started contrary to the general Doctrine and Practice of the Church; then suffering them to be handed down to Posterity, by Persons of Note and Character, till at last the Infection has spread so far, as that Lyes themselves have been firmly believ'd to be substantial Truths in those Churches.—

Mr. *Bingham* should not handle this Matter in such *dubious Terms*, as to say, “*They would hardly have related it, &c.*” ’Tis a Thing of too great Importance for us to be put off with such inconclusive ways of arguing. Historians have many times been so *careless*, as to relate, without Censure and Reflection on them, several things which were even contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church; and this, whether they do it easily or *hardly*, is no Matter, so long as they do it; ’tis a Proof against Mr. *Bingham’s* way of arguing. I know ’twill be expected that I should give some Instances of this; and therefore I will do so, even out of two of the Historians which Mr. *Bingham* has produc’d for the Truth of this Fable. *Johannes Moschus’s* Fable related by him without any Censure, concerning Children’s celebrating the Holy Eucharist, by the Hands of a Child, whom they chose to do the Office of a Priest, &c. [See p. 73.] is no Proof, that *Johannes Moschus* reckon’d this to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church: So

So *Nicephorus Calistus* his Story *, which he relates without any Censure, concerning a *Jew's* being miraculously heal'd of a dangerous Distemper, by being Baptiz'd with Sand for want of Water in a desert Place, is no Argument, that he believ'd Baptizing with Sand, or healing Distempers thereby, was agreeable to the general Sense of the Church : And if *Johannes Moschus*, and *Nicephorus Calistus*, had been so vain as to believe these Fancies, to have been agreeable to the Church's general Sense and Practice, yet such fabulous Writers Belief alone, without other concurring authentick Evidence, do's not prove that the Church's general Sense and Practice was of the same Nature with their ill-grounded Fables; for if this were a way of discovering the Church's general Sense and Practice, then all the idle Stories which have been handed down to us by fabulous Writers, if they believ'd them to have been agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Church, must be receiv'd as such; and so the senseless Dreams of Purgatory, of Adoration of Saints and Angels, and of the Worshipping of Images, together with the rest of the vain Trumpery of the Church of Rome, as related by some visionary, fabulous Writers, must be acknowledg'd to be, according to the general Sense

* *Judæus*—quidam in Locis Desertis, & inaquosis—nobiscum iter faciebat. Quum vero Morbo Repentino ita affligeretur, ut crederetur moriturus—comitibus suis obsecrando institit—ut Divini Lavacri participem facerent—Illi itaque detractis homini vestibus, arena quæ ibi erat pro aqua usi, in Nomine Patris, &c. tertium arena in eum coniecta Baptizarunt. Per hanc tam insolitam, & admirandam sacrorum mysteriorum initiationem, imbecillitate omni tanquam vinculo quodam is solutus, longe melius quam illi validus jam prorsus iter fecit. *Niceph. Calist. Eccles. Hist. Lib. iii. c. 37. Paris 1630.*

and Practice of the Church, which will bring us to a fine Pass indeed, if this be a good way of arguing.

But further; Mr. *Bingham* cannot prove, that even *Rufinus* himself, the first Relater of *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination, did really believe, that he made any such Determination at all: His speaking of it in *such dubious Terms as traditur statuisse*, "*it is said that he determin'd*," plainly implies his Diffidence about this Part of the Story; that *Socrates Scholasticus* utterly disbeliev'd it, is plain by his refusing to Copy it from *Rufinus*, as I have largely observ'd before. Add to this, that another of Mr. *Bingham's* Historians, *viz.* the Author of the Life of St. *Athanasius* in *Photius*, did not believe, that *Alexander's* Determination was made upon Mr. *Bingham's* Foundation; for that Author, whoever he was, * suppos'd, that the story'd Baptism by the Boy *Athanasius*, was done by some certain Divine Inspiration; and he judg'd so by the suppos'd Event, *viz.* *Alexander's* ordering the Children not to be Re-baptiz'd; as if he thought, that *Alexander* had known of the Divine Inspiration, and that he consequently esteem'd the Baptism to have been by God's Appointment, and therefore not to be repeated. What is this but a Supposition, that the Baptism was by Divine Commission and Authority? Nay, his judging so by the suppos'd Event of *Alexander's* Determination, signifies his Opinion to have been, that *Alexander* would not, or should not, have made such a Determination, if he had thought that the Baptism had been done without the Divine Commission and Authority:

* *Alexander ad se vocat, auditque non illos sacra irrifisse, sed ut ex eventu Colligas fecisse Divino quodam instinctu.*

Photii Biblioth. Cod. 258. p. 1430.

For why should he say, “*That we may collect the Baptism to have been by Divine Inspiration, from Alexander’s Determination about it;*” If he had believ’d that *Alexander* had Authority to make such a Determination concerning Baptism perform’d by Persons who never had any Divine Commission?

Thus we see, That there is no Ground to believe the Story of *Alexander’s* Determination, [Not to Baptize the Children who were before suppos’d to have been Baptiz’d by the Boy *Athanasius* in Play, without any Divine Commission.] I say, There is no Ground to Believe this Story to have been agreeable, but rather contrary to the General Sense and Practice of the Church; since *Rufinus*, the first Publisher of it, relates the Determination *as doubtful*; not venturing to be positive about it. *Socrates*, the more Judicious and Competent Historian, utterly discredits it, by not giving it any room in, but wholly leaving it out of his History, that part of it which he transcrib’d from *Rufinus*. And the unknown Author of the Life of St. *Athanasius*, tho’ he believes the Story of the Determination of *Alexander*, yet does it upon the foundation, of the Baptisms having been before done by Divine Inspiration; which, when *true and certain*, is the same as the Divine Commission, and so do’s not favour Baptisms done without any Commission at all. All these, thus discountenancing the Notion of *Alexander’s* Determining Baptism to be Good and Valid, when done without a Divine Commission, are *so many Evidences against* this Notion’s being the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church; and, together with all that has been said before, do abundantly betray the Story of *Alexander’s* suppos’d Determination to be no better than a meer Fable.

Mr.

Mr. Bingham tells us, He believes "*There is no Canon that does antecedently Authorize one Youth, without Necessity to Baptize another,*" pag. 32. But this Reverend Gentleman would have done us more Justice, if he had also added, That there is no Canon at all for Boys to Baptize, even in Cases of **greatest Necessity**; for his Words stand so loose, as to leave room for his Reader to believe, that there may be a Canon for Youths to Baptize in times of Necessity.

He says again, "*As to the Fact of Athanasius, any One will readily own, that there was neither Canon nor Precedent, Perhaps, to warrant the Doing it; and it would be strange, if any such Canon should be made in the Church,*" pag. 32. But why must we have this **Perhaps** clapp'd in? It is more fair, to let the Reader know **Certainly**, that there never was any such Canon or Precedent at all: These **Perhaps's** are no sure Guides to Enquiring Persons, especially in Cases which require more positive Determinations. The following Words, indeed, are something more home, "*It would be strange, if any such Canon should be made in the Church.*" This is very right; it would so: But why? What is the reason that it would be so strange? The Answer is very easie; Because it *never was the General Sense and Practice of the Church*; She never had any Precedent for it: This is the reason why such a Canon would be a strange thing. And now, is it not a fair Question to ask, Was it not *as strange* a thing, for a Bishop to Ratifie, what it would have been *strange* for the Church antecedently to Authorize? Was it not wholly new and strange, for Alexander to Determine that to be Valid, for which he had *no Precedent or Canon*: For if there was no Precedent or Canon

Canon for the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing, (and it would be *strange*, if any such Canon should be made.) Upon what foundation could *Alexander* Determine the Validity of *Athanasius's* Baptizing, when there was no Precedent of, or Canon for, such a Baptism before; and certainly, there was no Example of, or Canon for, any such Determination? So that, if *Alexander* had made the pretended Determination, it would have been a Novelty of his own; and consequently, no-ways Agreeable to, or Declaratory of, the General Sense and Practice of the Church.

Mr. *Bingham's* believing, that 'tis no easie matter
 “ to produce an ancient Canon, directly to Con-
 “ front the suppos'd Determination of *Alexander*,
 “ by Declaring, That such Irregular Baptisms are
 “ utterly Null and Void, tho' they have the Postnate
 “ Allowance of the Church where they are done,
 “ which (he says) was the peculiar Circumstance
 “ of the present Case, pag. 32, 33. is nothing at
 all to the purpose: Because, the Institution of Baptism, and the Laws of the Church, by requiring Baptism constantly to be administer'd by One vested with the *Divine Commission*, without making any Exceptions in favour of Baptism by such as never had that Commission; do leave these pretended Baptisms in the same state, as the Institution of Baptism found them at first, viz. in the State of Uninstituted Administrations, i. e. wholly Null and Void for the Purposes of the *Instituted Ministration*; because, no Ministration whatsoever of Baptism, could ever have been Valid for Christian Purposes, but by virtue of a Divine Institution; and the Ministration we are speaking of, was utterly destitute of any such Institution, except Mr. *Bingham* can prove it to have been by Divine Inspiration,

tion, as one of his Authors, we see, fancied it to have been ; and 'twas also without any Precedent or Canon to Authorize it, and so had neither Divine or Human Law, whereby to determine its Validity. And, certainly, when neither God nor his Church, had by any Law, given Validity to such Acts ; The first Determiner of their Validity must have run a great risk of Presumption, in pronouncing *that* Valid, which neither God nor his Church had ever before declar'd to be so : This would have been a Determination without any Rule ; And if such Determinations are fit to be made, and good and valid when done, then we shall have no Security for the Continuance of Divine Institutions ; since Man's arbitrary Will and Pleasure, without any Law, may substitute something else instead of them. It is not therefore enough for Mr. *Bingham* to say, that we can produce "*no Ancient Canon*" directly to Confront such Determination, by Declaring such Baptisms to be utterly **Null and Void**, *tho' they have the Postnate Allowance of the Church*. For if the Canon of Holy Scripture, and also the Canons of the Ancient Church, do constantly restrain the Ministration of Baptism, to those who have a Divine Commission, as they most certainly do ; this restraining of the Ministration to the Commission, is a Consequent Nulling of pretended Ministrations, which are done by those who never had that Commission ; (as I have largely endeavour'd to prove * elsewhere :) And therefore, 'till there shall be produced some Law of God, or some Canon of the Catholick Church, agreeable thereto, for the making Valid such *Uninstituted*

* *Dissenters Baptism Null and Void, &c.*

Ministrations; it will stand good, that they are Null and Void in themselves: And how, or by what Law, either of God or the Church, any *Post-nate* Allowance of the Bishop do's make them to be good and Valid, let our Reverend Historian inform us, if he can, for as yet he has not.

He says, indeed, "*There seem to be Two Ways of allowing any Act, either by an antecedent Authority given to a Man to perform it; or, by a subsequent Confirmation of the Thing, when done irregularly and without Authority, which is, ex post facto, an Allowance of it.*" And thus (says he) "*it is plain, the Baptisms given by Athanasius, were Allow'd and Confirm'd by Alexander in the Church,*" pag. 33. But here Mr. Bingham is not Certain; he says, "*There Seem to be Two Ways of Allowing,*" &c. This is not coming close to the Point; either there are certainly Two such Ways of Allowing Baptism, or *there are not*: We must have no *Medium* in this Case; there is no contenting with *May-be Baptisms*, those who would be *sure* of True Baptism. If there are really Two such Ways in the Church, of Allowing, &c. as Mr. Bingham speaks of, let him prove them; let him give good Reasons why One of them, *viz.* the Allowing of an Uninstituted Ministration of Baptism, by a Post-Fact, is *Valid*; as, we are sure, Baptism perform'd by virtue of an *Antecedent Commission*, is; and then we shall have an end of the Dispute about the Constant and Unalterable Necessity of a Previous Commission. But, 'till our Reverend Historian, or some other, shall produce good Proof for this, we shall acknowledge but One Valid Way in the Church of Allowing Baptism, *viz.* by an *Antecedent Authority* given by the Bishop, to a Man to Baptize.

The

The Other Way which Mr. Bingham proposes, of allowing Baptism, perform'd without a Commission, "by a subsequent Confirmation of it, which (he says) is, *ex post facto*, an Allowance of it," is a Power which *none can claim* but Christ the Supreme Head and Sovereign of the Church, and those who have receiv'd that Power from him. Let Mr. Bingham prove, That Bishops have receiv'd that Power from Christ; and then also this Point shall be given up to him. 'Till then, it is evident, that Bishops are only Christ's Deputies, and as such, are bound up to the Obedience of his Laws, and can validly act (in this Case) no farther than he has Commission'd them: And since the Commission for them to allow such Baptisms, by an After-Act, do's not appear, we must conclude, that it is not in being, and consequently, that they cannot Validly allow of such Baptisms as are perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd to Baptize. "And thus, 'tis plain," Alexander had no Authority to Confirm the Baptisms said to be given by the Boy *Athanasius* in Play. And in Fact, by what has been largely said before upon this Story, he never did confirm this Supposititious Ludicrous Baptism; nor was it ever consonant to the General Sense and Practice of the Church, that he should confirm such a Baptism.

It is now high time for me to beg the Reader's pardon, for detaining him so long upon the Refutation of this Fable. Mr. Bingham is so very zealous for it's Credit and Reputation, as "a genuine Piece of History," and his Name and Character are so advantageous for the Recommendation of it, that I thought it well worth while to be thus copious, in discovering the Weakness and Insufficiency, of the Foundation upon which 'tis built, that Men
may

may avoid the Danger of trusting and relying on it. I shall conclude my Observations upon this Fable, by remarking ; That if it had been a real Truth, If *Athanasius* the Boy had sportively Baptiz'd his Play-fellows, and If *Alexander* the Bishop had, by the Advice of his Clergy, appointed that those Children should have no other Baptism ; yet, nothing to the Purpose could be justly and safely inferr'd from it. For, 1st, We are seeking for the General Sense and Practice of the Church ; and this Act of **one Bishop**, never once taken notice of by the Ancient Catholick Church in Council, by way of approving it, or any thing like it, could not justly have been said to be the General Sense and Practice of the Church, and therefore it would have been nothing to the purpose of our Enquiry. 2^{dly}, Neither could any thing have been safely concluded from it ; for the natural Inference would have been only this, That *Alexander* reckon'd the sportive Baptism perform'd by the Boy, in the Name of the Trinity, to be Good and Valid, even tho' done without any Necessity, where Priests were to be had. Now, if Men will venture to affirm, that *Alexander's* suppos'd Opinion was just and right, and that therefore all such sportive Baptisms, are equally good and valid ; and this they must affirm, if they will maintain the other ; then it will unavoidably follow, That the **sacred and tremendous Institutions of the Deity**, and the most profound Reverence and Respect which we owe to the *Mediatorial Authority* of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the appointed Ministration of them, by those who bear *his Commission*, will be of no greater *Value* and *Esteem*, than Childrens Play ; because, as the present Lord Bishop of *Oxford* has excellently well observ'd,

serv'd, "There is no * *Majis and Minus*, in the
 " *Validity or Invalidity of Sacraments*, which cannot
 " *be partly Valid, and partly Invalid.*" And there-
 fore Childrens Sport and Play, in Imitation of
 Christian Sacraments, is advanc'd to an equal Dig-
 nity with the instituted Ministration of them; and
 what is this, but taking off *our Obligation* which
 we owe to the Divine Institutes, and making God's
 own Appointments to be but of a trifling Nature,
 since all the World agrees in this, That the Play of
 Children, is no better; and that we are under no
 Obligation to their Sports and Pastimes. This is
 an unavoidable Consequence of the *suppos'd Truth*,
 and imaginary Right and Justice, of the story'd
 Determination of *Alexander*: And how safe and
 secure it is, let all good Christians judge, when it
 cuts the very Sinews of all Divine Institutions, and
 carries on the accurs'd Design of Atheists and De-
 ists, to represent *all revealed Religion*, as needless,
 ridiculous, and childish, and consequently to be
 despis'd and trampled on by the *heedless, unthink-*
ing, and deceiv'd Multitude. For my part, I
 would not (to gain the whole World) be concern'd
 in propagating or defending Premisses so dread-
 fully dangerous, in their Consequences: And
 I sincerely pray to God, that none of his *Ambassa-*
dors, who are by him *intrusted* with the sacred *De-*
positum of his Divine Sacraments, may ever prosti-
 tute these inestimable Jewels, nor cast these inva-
 luable *Pearls before Swine*, by debasing the Mini-
 stration of them *so low*, as to make the giving of
 them, to amount to no more in Worth and Value,
 than the *inconsiderate Play* of silly Children. — But

* *Bishop of Oxford's Charge*, 1712. pag. 14.

not to be farther prolix upon this Matter, the Story before us deserves to be valued but as a Fiction; and if it had been true in Fact, would have been *foolish* and *ridiculous*; and as such, highly unworthy of being esteem'd, to have any the least Consonancy with the General Sense and Practice of the Church. Thus Mr. *Bingham* is hitherto got no farther than the Council of *Eliberis*, and *that* also has nothing in it, that can declare the Ancient Catholick Church's Sense, in favour of any Validity in pretended Baptisms, by Persons who *never were Commission'd* to Baptize; (as I have before noted.)

§ XIX. About Fifty Years after this Council, we find its Canon to Authorize some sort of Lay-Christians to Baptize, in want of a Priest, was so little known or taken notice of, by those who were *not of the Church of Spain*, that *Hilary* the Deacon of *Rome*, who is most reasonably suppos'd, to be the Author of the Comments on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, bearing the Name of *St. Ambrose*, says, concerning the Churches of his Time and Knowledge, thus; * “*Now, ——— neither the Inferior*
“*Clergy nor Lay-men are allow'd to Baptize.* The Inferior Clergy were but Lay-men, being inferior to Deacons, and having no Spiritual Power conferr'd on them; neither these, nor any other Lay-men, we see, were allow'd to Baptize in those Days, in the Churches that were within his knowledge: He had a particular fancy, That at first
“*the Apostles Impower'd all Christians to Preach and*

* Nunc ——— neque Clerici vel Laici Baptizant. *Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948.*

“*Baptize.*” This has been Answer’d in pag. 7, 8. Now, tho’ his Evidence for what he supposes the Apostles to have done, above Three hundred Years before his Time, be not good, for the Reasons I have there given; yet he may reasonably be admitted, for a Witness of the Sense and Practice of the Churches of his own Time and Place, and he is positive as to these, that “*Lay-men were not allowed to Baptize.*” This is an Argument, that the Canon of the Spanish Council of *Eliberis*, made to Authorize some sort of their own Lay-men to Baptize, in Cases of Extremity, when a Priest was not to be had, was *not the General Sense and Practice* of the Church in *Hilary’s* Days; for if it was, the Church of *Rome* may reasonably be suppos’d to have had the same Practice, and *Hilary* the Deacon of *Rome* may as reasonably be thought to have known of it, and so could not have justly said, That in his Time Lay-men were not allow’d to Baptize: He makes *no Exceptions for Cases of Necessity*, as if they were allow’d to do it in those Cases; and therefore we may conclude, That in the Churches of his Time and Knowledge there was no such Practice as the allowing of Lay-men to Baptize, even in Cases of Necessity, nor any Canon to Impower them to do so.

§ XX. The next in order, who instructs us in this Matter, but whose Evidence is wholly omitted by Mr. Bingham, is “*Pacianus Bishop of Barcelona, no less famous for the Holiness of his Life, than the Eloquence of his Discourse,*” says St. Jerom. This holy Bishop, in his Sermon of *Baptism* address’d to the *Catechumens*, sets forth the Misery of Man by the Fall of our First Parents, and proves, That we are all by Nature born in Sin; then

then he proceeds to shew the great Necessity of our Regeneration, and New Birth by Jesus Christ: Says he, * “ *Are not we begotten by Christ, that we may be sav’d thro’ Him?* — He shews how this New Birth was brought about, viz. in short, By our Saviour’s taking upon him, and uniting unto Himself, our whole Human Nature; By his *Mystical Marriage therein* to his Spouse the Church; By the Descent of his Holy Spirit, the Celestial Seed, upon our Souls, whereby we grow in the Bowels of our Mother the Church; and being born of her sacred Womb, are quicken’d and enliven’d in Christ. “ Thus † (says he) Christ “ [per suos Sacerdotes] by his Priests, begets Children in his Church; and the Spirit of God brings them forth, at the Font, [i.e. in Baptism,] Manibus Sacerdotis, by the Hands of the Priest. — Then

* Nunquid nos à Christo geniti sumus, ut propter ipsum salvi esse possimus? — Novissimis temporibus animam utique cum carne accepit Christus ex Maria, hanc venit salvam facere, hanc apud inferos non reliquit, hanc Spiritui suo conjunxit, & suam fecit. Et hæ sunt nuptiæ Domini, uni carni conjunctæ, ut secundum illud magnum Sacramentum fierent duo in carne una Christus & Ecclesia. Ex his Nuptiis Christiana plebs nascitur, veniente de super Spiritu Domini: nostrarumque animarum substantiæ, superfuso & admixto protinus Semente Cœlesti, visceribus matris inolescimus, alvoque ejus effusi vivificamur in Christo. — † Sic generat Christus in Ecclesia per suos Sacerdotes. — Atque ita Christi Semen, id est, Dei Spiritus, novum Hominem alvo matris agitaturn, & partu fontis exceptum, manibus Sacerdotis effundit, fide tamen pronuba. — Hæc autem Compleri aliàs nequeunt, nisi Lavacri & Chrismatis & Antistitis Sacramento. Lavacro. n. peccata purgantur, Chrismate Sanctus Spiritus superfunditur, utraque vero ista, manu & ore Antistitis impetramus: atque ita totus Homo renascitur & innovatur in Christo. S. Paciani Barcelonensis Episcopi Sermo ad Fideles Catechumenos de Baptismo. Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 4. Colon. p. 247.

summing up the whole Matter, he expressly affirms, That "*These Things [i. e. our Regeneration, and New Birth] cannot be accomplish'd, any otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and [the Ministry] of the Bishop. By Baptism, Sins are purged away; by Chrism, [i. e. Confirmation] the Holy-Ghost is poured out upon us; and both these we obtain by the Hand and Mouth of the Bishop: And so the whole Man is Born again and Renew'd in Christ.*" From which Words of this holy Bishop, nothing less can be collected than this, That he reckon'd, *That the Regeneration and New Birth of Christians, according to Divine Revelation, on which he founds his whole Discourse) cannot be accomplish'd by any other Baptism than that which is administer'd by One having a Priestly Power to Baptize: I say, no less than this can be inferr'd from his Words; 1st, Because he makes it necessary for us to be Regenerated by Christ himself. 2d/y, Because he says, Christ do's this by his Priests, i. e. such as have his Authority and Commission to minister in this part of his Priestly Office. 3d/y, Because he affirms, It cannot be accomplish'd otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and [the Ministry] of the Bishop, which plainly implies, that they must both, in some sense or other, be ministred to us by the Bishop; because he says, in the Words immediately following, that we obtain the Benefits of both [Baptism and Chrism] "By the Hand and Mouth of the Bishop."* So that, according to Pacianus, the Baptism must either be ministred by the Bishop himself in Person; or else [that it may be still by his Ministry] it must be by One, who is really Commission'd, Authoriz'd, or Impower'd by him; which makes it to be the Bishop's Act, and

and consequently, to be *Christ's*, whose more *immediate Representative* he is. Thus this holy Father, without any Regard to (what some call) Cases of Necessity, teaches us, That the New Birth **cannot** be *effected* but by *Episcopal Baptism*; he knew of no other Way to accomplish it, he affirms that there **cannot** be any other Way; and this he teaches his Candidates for Baptism, without giving them any hopes of ever attaining to this New Birth, (in the greatest Extremity) without it.

If in his Days the Church had any right sense of Regeneration, and a New Birth, to be effected by such Washings as are now perform'd by Persons who never were at all Commission'd by the Bishop to Baptize, and whose Acts, consequently, cannot upon any account whatsoever, be truly said to be the Bishop's Ministration, and therefore they are not *Christ's*: I say, If the Church had then held such Washings to be Good and Valid Baptisms, and had believ'd this upon good grounds; would so holy a Bishop as *Pacianus*, have been so bold as to have limited the Outward Means of our Spiritual Regeneration and New Birth, to *Episcopal Baptism, &c.* only? If he had known of our *modern Latitude*, and the *Goodness* and *Validity* thereof; would he not, at least, have encourag'd his Catechumens so far, as to have let them know, that in *absence of a Priest*, they might be brought to this Second Birth by the Hands of *any Lay-Christian whatsoever*, tho' he was never Commission'd to Baptize? Sure, if this had been the then *General Sense and Practice of the Church*, was *Pacianus* Bishop of *Barcelona* ignorant of it? Or, if he knew it, would he have hidden so useful a Piece of Knowledge from his Catechumens, and

led them into a contrary, and (what some of our Moderns call) an *Uncharitable Notion*, That only *Episcopal Baptism*, and no other, can be a Means of our Second Birth? No, certainly, so holy a Bishop would never, in his Instructing of the Ignorant, have instill'd an *Uncharitable, False Doctrine* into them, contrary to the *Lawful, General Sense and Practice* of the Church, if Baptism, by *whomsoever Christian* perform'd, was then justly esteem'd to be Valid, by the Church's General Sense and Practice. Is it not rather evident, that *Episcopal Baptism alone*, was, in the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* in his Days, the only Means of our Regeneration? Do's it not plainly appear to have been so, by his Instructing such as were, before their Baptism, to be taught the more *necessary Truths* of Christianity, That this *only* was the Means of their Second Birth? If any Baptism with Water, and pronouncing the Form, *In the Name of the Trinity*, had been Valid, as some now say it is, What need was there of keeping Catechumens under *so long a Discipline* and Instruction as was then practis'd, and telling them, That their Regeneration and New Birth could not be accomplish'd "*any otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and the Ministry of the Bishop*;" and that we obtain the Benefits of "*Both these* by the Hands and Mouth of the "*Bishop*?"

If our Modern Notions had been true, Catechumens might have been Regenerated in Baptism by a *Shorter Way*; for the great *Zeal* they had, to procure as soon as possible this Spiritual Benefit, would have made 'em run to any other than an *Episcopal Hand* for Baptism, if they had been taught, that such Baptism *was as good as the Bishops*: They might have sav'd them-

themselves the *Penance of Long Delays, &c.* impos'd on them before they were admitted to *Episcopal Baptism*; and might have obtain'd the *Long'd-for End* of all their *Toil and Labour*, by another Baptism in a *much shorter Time*, and with *less Pains*, without *submitting* to such *appointed Preparations*, and *confining* themselves to the *Will and Pleasure of the Bishop*, for the *Time of their Initiation* into the *Church of Christ*, upon our *Modern Schemes of Liberty and Latitude*. But *Pacianus* and his *Catechumens* were not such *Free-thinkers*; they were *limited* in their *Opinions* by *Divine Laws*, and *Ecclesiastical Constitutions agreeable thereto*; and in *Conformity to these*, that holy Bishop taught, and his *Catechumens* believ'd, (as those of other Churches, doubtless did, if we may judge of their *Belief* by their *pious Practice*, of submitting to these appointed Delays, and waiting patiently for Baptism by the Bishop's Authority) "*That the Regeneration and New Birth of Christians, cannot be accomplish'd any otherwise, than by Episcopal Baptism,*" &c. and that consequently, those *Washings* which are *not Episcopal*, are *Ineffective Acts*, and not *Means of Accomplishing our Spiritual Regeneration*; and therefore *Null and Void* for the *Purposes of Episcopal Baptism*: For if they are good and valid, then our *Regeneration and New Birth can be accomplish'd* without the Bishop's Baptism and Chrism; which is contrary to *Pacianus's Assertion*, who says, That "*they cannot be accomplish'd without 'em.*"

§ XXI. In the same Century liv'd *Optatus* Bishop of *Milevis*, a City of *Numidia* in *Africa*, whose Opinion *Mr. Bingham* gives us in his 44th Page, thus; "*Optatus (says our Historian) —*

“ thought that Christ gave a Commission to his Apostles
 “ to Baptize, but yet not such an one, as perempto-
 “ rily annull’d and evacuated all Baptisms that were
 “ performed by any other. Our Saviour (says
 “ Optatus) gave Commandment in whose Name
 “ the Nations should be Baptized: But he did not
 “ Determine, without Exception, by whom they should
 “ be Baptiz’d. He said not to his Disciples, This
 “ shall ye do, and no other shall do it. For*, whoever
 “ Baptizes In the Name of the Father, Son, and
 “ Holy-Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles. —
 Optatus concludes, “ That it was the Name of the
 “ Trinity, and not the Work of the Agent, that
 “ sanctifies the Mystery; and that the Ministers of
 “ Baptism were only Labourers, and not Lords of
 “ the Action.” This Quotation Mr. Bingham pro-
 “ duces, to shew that Optatus held, “ All those to
 “ have Baptism, wheresoever or by whomsoever
 “ Baptiz’d, that had receiv’d it in Faith, and with-
 “ out Dissimulation, in that Form of Words which is
 “ prescrib’d by the Gospel,” &c. for Mr. Bingham
 adds, a little after those Words, thus; “ Optatus
 “ was plainly of the same Opinion, p. 45. Now,
 upon the reading of Optatus’s Words, if they must
 be taken in the full Sense of his [*Quisquis*] **Who-**
ever; ’tis plain, That he utter’d only his own
 private Opinion, and not the General Sense and
 Practice of the Church.

For, 1st, The word [*Quisquis*] **Whoever**, is
 of both Genders, and includes Women as well as
 Men; and so if we take Optatus’s Opinion in the
 full Extent of his own Words, we shall make him

* *Quisquis* in Nomine Patris Filii & Spiritus Sancti Baptiza-
 verit, Apostolorum Opus implevit. Optat. contra Parmen, lib. 5.
 pag. 50.

to have held, That Baptism ordinarily perform'd by any Person, whether Woman as well as Man, if done with the Use of the Form, in the Name of the Trinity, was Good and Valid; for no less than this is included in the full Sense of *Optatus's Quisquis* [Whoever, &c.] This Latitude, is contrary to what Mr. Bingham acknowledges, viz. That "As to ordinary Cases, it is agreed on all hands, That Women were absolutely forbidden to meddle with any Ecclesiastical Office, and Baptism in particular." And Mr. Bingham as fairly agrees also, "That the Ancient Church did not allow them to Baptize in Extraordinary Cases of extreme Necessity," p. 46. And, finally, he does not venture to Determine, that Baptism by Women is good and valid, but leaves it "to the Judgment of others, and farther Enquiry," pag. 49. And yet this Passage of *Optatus*, [Whoever Baptizes, &c.] allows of the Validity of Baptism by Women, tho' the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church gives not the least Countenance to the suppos'd Validity thereof by Mr. Bingham's own Confession.

And, 2dly, *Optatus's Quisquis* [Whoever, &c.] is of so great a Latitude, That it admits of Baptism to be Valid, tho' perform'd by Unbaptiz'd Infidels, Jews, or Pagans, whether Men, Women, or even Children, who were never Commission'd for this Sacred Function; a Latitude so very unaccountable, that Mr. Bingham confesses, 'tis "One of the Novelties of Popery,— p. 98. utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church," pag. 100. And therefore, upon Mr. Bingham's own Principles, *Optatus's Quisquis* [Whoever Baptizes, &c.] allowing of the Validity of Baptism by Women, and also by Unbaptiz'd Infidels, Jews, or Pagans, whether

whether Men, Women, or Children ; was no-ways consonant to the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, but a *Novel, Singular* Opinion of his own, and therefore of no value in our present Enquiry after the *Ancient Church's Catholick Tradition* : And so *Optatus's* Opinion is a perfect Blank in this Dispute ; *because his* [Quisquis,] *his Whoever Baptizes, &c.* is of so *unlimited* an *Extent* and *Latitude*, as that it can no ways be accounted for in the *Church's General Sense and Practice* —

§ XXII. But I am not so uncharitable as to believe that *Optatus* was so great a *Latitudinarian* as some of our *Moderns* represent him ; I don't think that He would have stood by this singular Notion which *Mr. Bingham* fathers on him, *viz.* That “ *Baptism, wheresoever or by whomsoever administered, is Good and Valid,* in his *pag. 45.* For tho' *Optatus* does uncautiously say, *Quisquis — Baptizaverit, &c. Whoever Baptizes —* “ *fulfils the Work of the Apostles* ; which if taken in an unlimited Sense, makes all Baptism by Persons never Commission'd, in Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, whether by Men, Women, or Children, Christians in or out of Communion with their Bishop, Excommunicates, or Apostates, Infidels, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, &c. if done with the Form, In the Name of the Trinity, to be Good and Valid : Which Latitude of Baptism by Women, Infidels, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges, has no Precedent in the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, and the latter of Baptism by Infidels, he calls “ *One of the Novelties of Popery,* ” &c. (as before observed :) Yet, I say, to do something towards taking off the Reproach, which, by such a *Latitudinarian* Notion, is cast on
this

this Bishop, I should charitably consider the Occasion of his Words, and from thence judge of his Meaning by them: He was engag'd in Dispute with the *Donatists*, a *Puritanical, Schismatical* Sect, who (tho' they retain'd Episcopacy) separated from the Church, because they reckon'd the Catholics to be *defil'd*, and *polluted*, and *abominable*, not to be Communicated withal, by reason of their Communion with some whom the *Donatists* charg'd to have been *Traditors*, to have yielded in time of Persecution, and to have deliver'd up the Holy Books into the Hands of the Heathen: Upon this account, they reckon'd the Catholics to be the *Schismatics*, and that they were so *impure*, that all their Ordinations, and other Ministrations, were Null and Void; and the *Donatists*, in consequence of this false Charge, Re-baptiz'd all who came over to their Party, tho' they had been before Baptiz'd in the Church, by Catholic Bishops, Priests, or Deacons.

Optatus, in the Book quoted by our Reverend Historian, endeavours to convince the *Donatists*, that if the *Catholics* had been *Schismatics*, yet their Baptism would be Valid notwithstanding, and therefore ought not to be repeated: In his *First Book*, he wonders that *Parmenian* the *Donatist* should say, (of the suppos'd *Schismatics*, after this manner,) † “How can a Man that is *defil'd*,
“*cleanse another by a false Baptism? How can an*
“*impure Man purifie? How can One that makes*
“*others fall, lift up those that are fallen down?*
“*How can One that is Guilty, grant Pardon? or*
“*One that is Condemn'd, Absolve?* *Optatus* denies, that this can be said of those that are only

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 88, 89. Lond.*

“ Schismatics, who, as he thinks, may Lawfully
 “ administer the Sacraments. He tells Parme-
 nian “ * *Schism, which breaks the Bond of Peace, is*
 “ *begotten by Discord, nourish'd by Envy, and con-*
 “ *firm'd by Disputes; thus impious Children forsake*
 “ *the Catholick Church their Mother, withdraw and*
 “ *separate themselves—being cut off from the Church,*
 “ *and become Rebels and Enemies: But they inno-*
 “ *vate nothing in Doctrine, still retaining what they*
 “ *had learned from their Mother.*” And he con-
 cludes, That “ Schismatics have preserv'd the
 “ True Sacraments of the Church, tho' they are
 “ separated from its Body.” In his 5th Book, the
 very Book from whence Mr. Bingham takes his
 Quotation, *Optatus* proves, that in the Sacrament
 of Baptism, it is not absolutely necessary, “ † that
 “ the Minister should be Faithful and Just; be-
 “ cause the Ministers are chang'd every Day, and
 “ it is Jesus Christ who Baptizes— And the Ho-
 “ liness of the Minister, do's not contribute” to
 the Holiness of the Sacrament; just as the Church
 of England teaches concerning “ || *the Unworthiness*
 “ *of the Minister, which hinders not the Effect of the*
 “ *Sacraments:*” All which being duly weighed and
 consider'd, by a Man of a candid Temper, will in-
 cline him to believe, that *Optatus's* “ *Quisquis,*
 “ *whosoever Baptizes—fulfills the Work of the Apo-*
stles;” was design'd by him only to mean the Bap-
 tizers he was then disputing for, viz. the then Mi-
 nisters of Baptism, whom the *Donatists* reckon'd to
 be Schismatics, and so polluted, that (even tho'
 they were ordain'd Bishops, Priests, or Deacons)
 their Ministrations were defiled by them, and upon

* *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 88, 89.*

† *Ibid. p. 93. Lond.*

|| *As in her 26th Article.*

that Account wholly Null and Void; *Optatus*, in Opposition to this, shews, that if the Ministers of Baptism were such Sinners, yet their Sins did not hinder the Efficacy of the Sacraments administer'd by their Hands: And says, "*Whoever Baptizes*" [i. e. candidly interpreting his Words] whoever Minister, whether Catholick or Schismatick, Baptizes "*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles.*" And we know, that in those Days, the allow'd Ministers of Baptism, whether Catholicks or Schismaticks, were only such as were **Commission'd by Bishops**: And this will make nothing for the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were *Episcopally Commission'd* to Baptize. So that, whether we take *Optatus's* Words in this more candid Sense of them, with regard to the Subject of his Dispute, or in the full Extent and Meaning of them, as they stand by themselves; this Father is no Evidence, that the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Church, gives Countenance to any Validity in pretended Baptisms, perform'd by such as never were Commission'd to Baptize.

§ XXIII. The next ancient Writer I shall consider, is *St. Basil*, Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, Ordain'd about the Year 369, whom our Reverend Historian takes notice of in his 39th Page thus: "*As to St. Basil*, it will be readily own'd, that he had somewhat of a singular Opinion in this Matter; for he was for Re-baptizing all Persons that were **only Baptiz'd by Lay-men**, as he was also for Re-baptizing all that were Baptiz'd by Heretical and Schismatical Priests; for he brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor, in

“ in the See of *Cæsarea*, arguing after this manner:
 “ * *Hereticks and Schismaticks are broken off from*
 “ *the Church, and become Lay-men, and there-*
 “ *fore have no Power to Baptize——— Therefore*
 “ *such as are Baptiz'd by them, when they return to*
 “ *the Church, are to be Re-baptiz'd with the true*
 “ *Baptism of the Church, as being only Baptiz'd*
 “ *by Lay-men.*” This is a very full Evidence
 against the Validity of Lay-Baptism; for whether
 St. Basil's Opinion, that Heretical and Schismatical
 Baptisms were the same as Lay-Baptisms, was true
 or false, this is certain, that he makes the Invali-
 dity of Lay-Baptism, to be the *Standard*, the in-
 contested Principle, whereby he Judges of the In-
 validity of Baptism by Heretical and Schismatical
 Priests. There were before, and in his Days, *no*
publick Disputes of any Churches against the Inva-
 lidity of Baptism by Lay-men, *i. e.* Men who had
no Power or Commission to Baptize; for St. Basil cer-
 tainly means such Persons, when he speaks of Lay-
 men; because he reckons Heretical and Schismatical
 Priests to be but *as Lay-men*, and therefore to have
no Power to Baptize, i. e. as if he had said, Lay-men
 are such Persons as are destitute of Power to Bap-
 tize; Hereticks and Schismaticks are become Lay-
 men, and therefore Hereticks and Schismaticks have
 no Power to Baptize: I say, the Churches before,
 and in the Days of St. Basil, had no Disputes against
 the Invalidity of Baptisms by St. Basil's Lay-men;
 If they had, where are the publick Records of this
 Dispute? Mr. Bingham neither has, nor can ever
 produce, any such Records; and therefore we shall
 conclude, that the Invalidity of Baptisms perform'd

* Basil Epist. I. ad Amphil. cap. I.

by St. Basil's Lay-men, *i. e.* by Persons destitute of Power to Baptize, was an allowed Principle in the Churches of his Days.

Nay, the Practice of the Ancient Church of Spain, [the Bishops whereof, in the Council of *Eliberis*, made a Canon to empower some, and not others, of their own Lay-men, who were in Communion with their Bishops, to Baptize in extreme Cases, where Priests could not be had,] confirms the general Principle of the Invalidity of Baptism perform'd by Persons not authoriz'd, *i. e.* by St. Basil's Lay-men; because, if Baptism by Persons not Commission'd, had been then valid in the general Sense and Practice of the Church, those *Spanish* Bishops would have had no need of making a new Canon, to Authorize some Lay-men to do *that*, which the Catholick Church in Doctrine and Practice esteem'd to be good and valid, when done by any Lay-christian, *without such a suppos'd Authority.*

But Divine Revelation, and the general Sense and Practice of the Church, had excluded such Lay-men from that Ministration, this Exclusion of them render'd their Attempts, if they should have endeavour'd to Baptize, Null and Void, for want of the Commission requir'd by the Institution, which as much, and as constantly requires the Commission, as it does the Water and the Form: The Council of *Eliberis*, doubtless found things in this State; The Bishops thereof, 'tis reasonable to believe, saw Lay-men conscientiously refrain from usurping the Ministration of Baptism, upon the Account of their having no Power to Baptize; Lay-men doubtless abstain'd from it, as we do now, upon a common Principle of their *Inability* to minister the Means of our Regeneration and new Birth, to be administered

nister'd by Christ's commission'd Representatives: Some *Catechumens*, at a great Distance from a Church, it's very likely dy'd without Baptism for want of such a Commission'd Minister: The *Spanish* Bishops, hearing of such sort of Accidents, consider'd, how such *Catechumens*, in such Extremities, might receive *valid Baptism*; and supposing themselves to have sufficient Power so to do, made a new Canon to authorize some of their own Lay-Communicants, to Baptize such *Catechumens* in those Extremities, that so, such Lay-men might take Courage, and Act by a *suppos'd Commission* in that Ministration, which they before had reason to think could be of no Value if they attempted it without a Commission; and that *Catechumens* might not die in such Extremities without *suppos'd Baptism*; and also that those *Spanish* Bishops might not incur a *suppos'd Guilt*, of letting Men die without a *suppos'd Commission'd Baptism*. The Canon evidently supposes, that Lay-men in *Spain*, had no Power in themselves to Baptize; and no Churches oppos'd St. *Basil's* Assertion of the Invalidity of Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not impowered by Bishops to Baptize; he only found, that some Churches did not agree with him, that Heretical and Schismatical Priests, were the Same as Lay-men: And therefore, tho' his Opinion of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms being Null and Void, was not the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* in his Days, because many Churches differ'd from him therein; yet his Opinion of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* Baptism by Persons *never Commission'd*, was agreeable to the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church; because, no Church in Council did then or before, publicly oppose that Principle, but, on the contrary, all Canons confirm'd and establish'd it, by *wholly*

con-

Confining the Ministration of Baptism to Bishops, and those on'y who are Commission'd, or suppos'd to be Commission'd by them, and making no Exceptions by any Publick Ecclesiastical Declaration whatsoever, in favour of the Validity of Baptism by Persons who never were so Commission'd.

In short, St. Basil's Argument from St. Cyprian and Firmilian, reduc'd into Form, stands thus: Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not Impower'd or Commission'd to Baptize, is Null and Void—Heretical and Schismatical Priests, are become Lay-men; therefore Baptism, by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, is Null and Void. The Major Proposition, viz. Baptism by Laymen, Persons not Impower'd to Baptize, is Null and Void, was not publicly oppos'd by any Churches; but the Minor, viz. that Heretical and Schismatical Priests were become Lay-men, was Deny'd by several Churches; and therefore in Compliance with those Churches, he would not wholly insist upon his Conclusion, That Baptism, by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, was Null and Void; for He acquiesc'd in the Customs of some Churches, who reckon'd the Baptisms of some Schismatics to be Good and Valid. But this was no ways a Departing from the Incontestable Principle, That Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not Commission'd or Impower'd to Baptize, was Null and Void; because, his allowing some Schismatics not to be reduc'd to Lay-men, was only an Abatement from the Rigour of his Assertion, which He made before, concerning Hereticks and Schismatics without Distinction, when other Churches did not allow, that all Schismatics whatsoever were become Lay-men. Those Churches did not Dispute against His other Principle, of the Invalidity of Baptism by Persons Not Commission'd; and therefore

I

fore

fore it stood good, notwithstanding His Compliance, and their Practice, with respect to the other by Schismatical Priests.

§ XXIV. St. Chrysostom, Arch-Bishop of Constantinople, Anno 398. whom Mr. Bingham takes Notice of in his 17th, 18th, and 38th Pages, is full against the Validity of Baptism perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd to Baptize. His Words, as Mr. Bingham has noted 'em, are these;
 “ * 'Tis plain Madness to despise so Great a Power,
 [viz. that of the Priest] “ without which we cannot
 “ not obtain Salvation, or the good Things that are
 “ promised us. For if No One can enter into the
 “ Kingdom of Heaven, except he be born of Water
 “ and the Holy Ghost; and he that eats not the Flesh
 “ of the Lord, and drinketh not his Blood, is De-
 “ prived of Eternal Life; and all these things
 “ are perform'd, By No Other, but Those Sa-
 “ cred Hands, I mean the Hands of the Priest:
 “ How can any one, without these either escape
 “ the Fire of Hell, or Obtain the Crown that is laid
 “ up in Heaven.——† “ If there be a Necessity,
 “ and a Child be found Unbaptiz'd, and ready to
 “ Die, it is Lawful for a Deacon to Baptize it.”

These two Passages from St. Chrysostom, do establish what I observ'd before from Pacianus Bishop of Barcelona, That No One can Administer Baptism, as the Means of our Regeneration and New Birth, but such as either in a higher or lower Sense have a Priestly Power. St. Chrysostom is Express and Positive, that this Means of Regeneration is per-

* Chrysos. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 5.

† St. Chrysost. Hom. 61. Tom. 7. Edit. Savil, p. 423.

form'd “ **By No Other but Those Sacred Hands:** This is absolutely an Excluding of all others Whatsoever, nay, even in Cases of Necessity, for, *in articulo mortis*, when an Unbaptiz'd Child is ready to Die, St. Chrysostom points out no other than a *Priestly Hand* to Baptize it, viz. a Deacon, who who is so far a Priest, as he has receiv'd the *Priestly Power* to Administer this Sacrament in the Absence of the Bishop, who has the whole Priesthood, and of the Presbyter, who has the Next Degree of Sacerdotal Power. Mr. Bingham knows and acknowledges, that Deacons have so far a share of the *Priestly Power*, as they are authoriz'd to Baptize, &c. He knows also, that when Presbyters and Deacons (Persons Ordain'd by the Bishop to Baptize) do Administer this Holy Sacrament, their Act is, in the Language of the Ancients, *The Bishop's Act*, because they receiv'd their Commission from him: These Things consider'd, whoever of these, whether Presbyter or Deacon Baptizes, 'tis done by a *Priestly Power*. And St. Chrysostom is clear, that without *this Power* “ **we cannot obtain Salvation, or the good Things that are promis'd us.**” One of the Means of Salvation which he speaks of, is, the Sacrament of Baptism; and he says positively, that it is “ *perform'd by no other but the Sacred Hands of the Priest.*” If then, a Person never Commission'd to Baptize, and who is therefore *Destitute of Priestly Power*, attempts to Baptize, we “ **cannot obtain Salvation by his Hand,**” because there is *no Priestly Power*: He do's not minister the Means of Salvation; He gives us no Baptism of Regeneration, because such Baptism is perform'd by no other than “ *the Sacred Hands of the Priest;*” and the Hands of this Usurper are not those Sacred Hands, consequently he performs

nothing, and we obtain nothing by his Means. If such Sacrilegious Hands do minister *real Baptism*, Baptism whereby we may be born again, then there are other Hands besides the Priests, that perform this; tho' St. Chrysostom says there are *no other*: And if the pretended Baptisms, by Persons who have *no Priestly Power*, are Means of Salvation, then 'tis plain, we can obtain Salvation *without* the *Priestly Power*, tho' St. Chrysostom affirms expressly, that without this Power "**we cannot obtain Salvation:**" But I will sooner take this Saint's Word, in this important Matter, than trust to the dangerous Positions of some, who came after him; because, his Assertions are *clearly* founded on the Divine Oracles, the Holy Scriptures of the Word of God, that Sacred Standard of Truth, and only Safe Rule of our Faith and Practice: There, as we discover Christian Baptism, whereby we are born again, to be with no other Matter than *Water*, and in no other Form than that in the Name of the Trinity, whether Ordinarily or Extraordinarily; so, we *as certainly* find no other *Administrator* thereof, than one who is vested with *Apostolick*, i. e. *Priestly Power* or Authority, whether in Ordinary Cases, or in Times of Greatest Necessity; and our St. Chrysostom, keeping his Eye upon this *Sure Rule*, affirms, that we *cannot be saved* without this *Priestly Power*; and that there is *no other* than the Hand of one who is vested with this Power to minister to us Christian-Baptism, the Means of our Salvation: In no Case whatsoever can it be done by another, for even in Absence of the Bishop and Presbyter, none but a Deacon vested also with *Priestly Power to Baptize*, had Authority to do it: So far was he from the unaccountable Latitude of our Days, that he knew of no other

other Minister of Baptism, in Times of greatest Extremity, than an Episcopal Deacon, who was so far a Priest as he was impower'd by the Bishop to Baptize: And thus by St. Chrysostom's Rule, agreeable to that of the Holy Scripture, we cannot obtain Salvation; receive Baptism, the Means thereof, Ordinarily, or in Times of Extremity, "*without the Priestly Power.*"

§ XXV. About the latter end of the Fourth, or beginning of the Fifth Century, appear'd the Constitutions call'd Apostolical, as the Right Reverend Bishop Pearson, and after him the Reverend and Learned Doctor *Grabe inform us. These Constitutions, tho' in Matters relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, they have been interpolated by Anti-Trinitarian Hereticks; yet in Matters of Ancient Discipline, they inform us of several Things highly worthy of our Observation; among which, this of the Invalidity of pretended Baptism, perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd to Baptize, is very remarkable, which I shall give the Reader in Mr. Bingham's own Translation, pag. 41, 42.—Thus, "*It is an horrible thing for a Man to thrust himself into the Priest's Dignity, or Office, as the Corahites, and Saul, and Uzzias did; as it was not Lawful for a Stranger, that was not of the Tribe of Levi, to offer any thing, or approach the Altar without a Priest; so do ye nothing without the Bishop. For if any Man do's any thing without the Bishop, he do's it in Vain: it shall not be reputed to him as any Service. As Saul, when he had offer'd Sacrifice without Sa-*

* Spicileg. Patrum, Tom. 1. p. 284.

"muel, was told that he had done **Uainly**; so
 "whatever **Lay-man** do's any thing without a
 "Priest, he **Labours in Uain**. And as King
 "Uzzias, when he had invaded the Priest's Office,
 "was smitten with Leprosy for his Transgression;
 "so every **Lay-man** shall bear his Punishment that
 "contemns God, and insults his Priests, and takes
 "Honour to himself, not imitating **Christ**, who glo-
 "rify'd not himself, but staid till his Father said,
 "Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of
 "Melchizedeck." Now 'tis evident, that this
 whole Discourse is founded upon Scripture, and
 the Sense of it when apply'd to Baptism, is no
 less than this:

First, That whoever Lay-man, what Person so-
 ever, that was never Commission'd to Baptize, at-
 tempts this *Priestly Function*, which upon no ac-
 count whatsoever belongs to him, is a very great
 Transgressor in the sight of God, and his pretend-
 ed Service is "*Vain as to what concerns himself;*
 "for it shall never be accounted to him as accepta-
 "ble Service, worthy of a Reward, but rather in-
 "evitably make him liable to Wrath and Punish-
 "ment." So far Mr. Bingham acknowledges,
 pag. 42.

And, Secondly, I add, That from this Discourse
 'tis plain, that such a pretended Baptizer acts also
 in *Vain*, with respect to those whom he attempts to
 Baptize; he do's them **No Service** at all, if we
 will but be so just as fairly to consider the Scrip-
 ture-Instances here referr'd to, and to which our
 Usurper is compar'd: He is compar'd to the *Corah-
 bites*; now every Body that knows the History of
Corah's Rebellion, knows also that *Corah* offer'd In-
 cense in **Uain**, with respect to himself and to the
 rest of his rebellious *Accomplices* of the Congrega-
 tion,

tion, for whom he *pretended to offer*; for the Punishment fell on him, and that part of the Congregation also who did not offer, but *approv'd of his Offering*: So *Saul's* pretended Burnt-Offering was *Vain*, with respect to himself and others, for who was there that receiv'd *any Benefit* by it? The Punishment extended not only to him, but also to others, for himself and *his Children* too were for ever *Depriv'd* of the Kingdom for *this Usurpation*. Also *Uzziah's* attempting to offer Incense, if he had proceeded so far as to gain a Party to concur with him in the Usurpation, would doubtless have brought upon himself and his Accomplices, for defending his Sacrilege, a dreadful Punishment from God: But the *Priests* timely and courageously interpos'd, stop'd his Progress, and *thrust him away from the Altar of the Lord*, and so he had no Party in his Defence, that concurr'd with his *Sacrilegious Usurpation*. The **Stranger** also that was not of the Tribe of *Levi*, if he had attempted to offer any thing, or approach'd the Altar without a Priest, his Attempt would have *been Vain*; and he would have done No Acceptable Service, either for himself, or others concurring with and abetting his Usurpation; for, the same reason which would have made his pretended Service *Vain*, as to himself, would have made it also *Vain* as to others who should have concurred with him; because, they being concern'd with him in the Sin, cannot be suppos'd to receive any Benefit from that Sin of his, which they *concur with and encourage*. The Passage of the Constitutions, now before us, says, by way of Inference from the before-mention'd Instances, "So whatever Lay-man do's any thing without a Priest, he Labours in Vain," i. e. he Labours in Vain as *Saul*, &c. Labour'd in Vain; that is,

as they in their Usurpations Labour'd *in Vain*, and brought No Benefit to *themselves or others*; so our Lay-man, in his Usurpation, *Labours in Vain*, and to no Purpose in his pretended Ministrations; he brings no Benefit, but rather *Wrath and Punishment* to himself and others for whom he pretends to minister, who concur with and approve of his usurped Acts. Our Reverend Historian is so sensible of this, that he acknowledges, Page 41. That this Passage "**Seems** to pronounce severely of usurp'd and unauthoriz'd Actions, as utterly Null and Void;" but by what has been said, 'tis plain this Passage do's more than **Seem** to pronounce so, it do's really say they are done **in Vain**: "*What-ever Lay-man do's any thing without a Priest he Labours in Vain,*" and therefore his Act is utterly Null and Void.

§ XXVI. Mr. Bingham, Page 33. produces St. Jerom in the latter end of the Fourth Century, as an Evidence for Lay-Baptism: His Words are these, "*St. Jerom—Derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to Baptize, from the Original Power of the Bishop; yet in Cases of Necessity, he, (i. e. St. Jerom *) says "it was also allow'd frequently to Lay-men: For in such Cases, he that had receiv'd Baptism, might give it to others."* Thus Mr. Bingham gives us St. Jerom's Words. St. Jerom in this Place says, that it is **Lawful** for Laicks to baptize, "*when Necessity Compels,*" [*Licere Laicis, says he*]

* Sine Chrismate & Jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habent Baptizandi. Quod frequentur (si tamen Necessitas cogit) Scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit qui, ita & dare potest. Hieronomi Dialog. cum Luciferian, c. 4.

But now the Question is to *What Law* do's he refer us for the Lawfulness of this? *First*, Is it to the Law of God? *Secondly*, Is it to the Law of the Ancient Catholick Church? Or, *Thirdly*, Is it to some private Maxim, which with him stands instead of a Law, as a self-evident Principle, that wants no other Law to enforce it? One of these he must refer us to, when he talks of a **Lawful Act**; otherwise his saying 'tis Lawful has no Signification at all.

First, Then, I say that he refers us to *No Law of God* for the *Lawfulness* of Laicks Baptizing in Cases of Necessity; because there is no such Law extant in his written Word, if there is, let it be produced, that Men may not remain in Ignorance about it.

Secondly, St. *Ferom* can refer us to *No Law* of the Ancient Catholick Church; for she never made any such Law. If she did, when and where did she make it? In which of her *General Councils* was it enacted? Certainly not in any One of them; and no less than this, can make it a *Law of the Catholick Church*; and whatsoever falls *short* of this, is insufficient to shew the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*. Shall it be then suppos'd that St. *Ferom* has an Eye to the *Spanish Council of Eliberis's* Canon, made to empower some sort of Lay-men to Baptize *Catechumens*, in danger of Death, when a Priest could not be had? Why even this will not do neither; for that Council being but a particular Provincial One, and so *very Singular* in this Matter, that we have no other Instance of the like in the whole Christian World in those Days, its Canon was *no Law* to the Churches where St. *Ferom* liv'd, and so the *Lawfulness* of Lay-mens Baptizing could have no reference to
that

that Canon, except it could be prov'd that he is speaking only of the Lay-Subjects of the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council, that it was *Lawful* for *them* to Baptize in Cases of Extremity; yet even this would not serve for our Lay-Baptisms, which are notoriously without any Necessity, by Persons who are not so much as suppos'd to Act by virtue of any Canon, and who attempt to Baptize, not only without having been ever Commission'd at all, but also in *direct* profess'd *Opposition* to that Apostolick, *i. e.* Episcopal Authority, from whence alone all Commissions to Baptize must flow. St. *Jerom* never once spoke of such *pretended Baptisms* as these; for the Church in his Days had *no Experience* of them. But to return to the Lay-Baptisms he speaks of: Do's St. *Jerom* then refer us to the Will and Pleasure of the particular Bishops of those Laicks, and say, that 'twas Lawful for them to Baptize, because their respective Bishops *authoriz'd* them to do so, in Absence of the Clergy? But how shall we know this, where do's it appear? And if it were so, this would not determine it to be *Lawful* by the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church, for the Will and Pleasure only of some particular Bishops, is no Law of the *Catholick Church*; and besides even this also, if it were allow'd that particular Bishops could and did authorize their own Lay-men, will not prove the Lawfulness or Validity of our Lay-Baptisms, which are evidently such as are done by Persons never *authoriz'd* at all by their respective Bishops. So that it must follow therefore that,

Thirdly, St. *Jerom*, as a suppos'd Evidence of the general Sense and Practice of the Church, refers us to *no other Law*, whereby to determine the Lawfulness of Laicks Baptizing in Cases of Necessity,

sity, than that false Maxim, which, with a little Variation, he plainly appears to have borrow'd from *Tertullian*, when he says, That *what a Man has receiv'd, he can also give to others*; as if this were an undoubted Principle, and in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, of equal force with a Law; and that therefore, *St. Jerom* knew that 'twas *Lawful* for Laicks to Baptize in Cases of Extremity: But the Weakness of this Position I have already expos'd, *Page 43.* to which I further add here, that if this false Principle was the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, then it will follow, that if Lay-mens Baptisms are Lawful upon that Foundation, then, a meer Presbyter having receiv'd a Power to Baptize, to Administer the other Sacrament, to Preach, and to Absolve, &c. can Lawfully give this Power also to others; and even a Deacon too may give Power to Baptize, if *what is receiv'd can be given to others by the Receiver*; Consequences so false in Fact, (tho' necessarily arising from such a suppos'd Maxim) that the Principle from whence they flow was certainly at no Time the "*General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*"; and therefore this Principle being the Measure of the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in *St. Jerom's* Opinion, is no Argument for the Lawfulness thereof in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, about which we are still Inquiring.

§ XXVII. Let us then see whether *St. Jerom* do's not on the other side, make Lay-Baptism to be Invalid, upon Catholick Principles: And in order thereto, 'tis to be observ'd, that after the Great Council of *Nice*, *Lucifer* Bishop of *Calaris* in the Island of *Sardinia*, resolv'd to have no Conversation or Correspondence with any of the Bishops, who

who had receiv'd into their Communion, those that had formerly sign'd the *Arian* Creeds. He withdrew himself therefore into his own Island, and separated from the Communion of almost all the Bishops in the World; he dy'd in this Resolution, and left some Followers, call'd *Luciferians*, who spread themselves over all the World. These *Luciferian* Separatists insisted upon it, that the Orders of the *Arian* Bishops and Clergy were Null and Void, because they were Hereticks; and that upon their Repentance and Union to the Catholick Church, they ought not to be receiv'd into the Number of the Clergy, when the same *Luciferians* receiv'd Lay-*Arians* to Communion, only by Imposition of Hands, tho' they had been Baptiz'd by the *Arian* Clergy. St. *Jerom*, in his Dialogue against those Schismatics, introduces an Orthodox Christian disputing with a *Luciferian*, in Defence of the Practice of the Catholicks, who receiv'd not only Lay-repenting *Arians* to Communion, but also receiv'd *Arian* Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, upon their Repentance, in the same Rank and Degree of Clergy-men, as they held while they were Hereticks: And the Argument which *Orthodox* uses in Defence of this Practice of the Church, is in short thus; You acknowledge by your Practice that the Baptism administer'd by the *Arian* Clergy is good and valid, because you receive their Laicks Baptiz'd by them without repeating their Baptism; You ought therefore to acknowledge the Orders of their Clergy, otherwise you must reject the Baptism administer'd by them, whom you do not own to be Priests. The *Luciferian* was not able to get over this, he had no Reply (in our Modern Stile) that Baptism, by Persons who have no Priestly Power, is good and valid: He might have

con-

confounded *Orthodox's* Reasoning with this Answer, if it had then been agreeable to the *General Sense and Practice of the Church*; but he yielded to the force of the Argument, and was convinc'd by this Principle, that Baptism by One Not having a Priestly Power to Baptize, ought to be rejected; and therefore we may conclude that this was a receiv'd Maxim in the Church in those Days.

But to give the Reader a little farther Insight into this *Dialogue*, that he may see the Truth of what I say, I shall here set down the Sense of some of it, out of St. *Jerom*, according to the *Benedictine Monk's* Edition, thus:

(1) *Orthodox*. "Shew me, why you receive
" a Laick, who comes over from the *Arians*, when
" you receive not an [*Arian*] Bishop?

(2) *Luciferian*. "I receive an *Arian* Laick,
" who Confesses that he has been in an Error;
" and the Lord would rather have the Repen-
" tance, than the Death of a Sinner.

(3) *Orthod*. "Receive therefore the Bishop
" also, who likewise Confesses that he has been in
" an Error; and the Lord would rather have the
" Repentance, than the Death of a Sinner.

(4) *Lucif*. "If the *Arian* Bishop Confesses
" that he has Err'd; Why do's he continue a Bi-

(1) *Orthod*. Expone mihi quare Laicum venientem ab Arianis recipias, Episcopum non recipias?

(2) *Lucif*. Recipio Laicum qui errasse se confitetur, & Dominus mavult poenitentiam peccatoris quam mortem.

(3) *Orthod*. Recipe ergo & Episcopum, qui & errasse se confitetur, & Dominus mavult penitentiam peccatoris quam mortem.

(4) *Lucif*. Si errare se confitetur: Cur Episcopus perseverat? Deponat Sacerdotium, concedo veniam poenitenti.

shop?

“shop? Let him give over his Priesthood, and
 “I grant Pardon to the Penitent.

(5) *Orthod.* “And I will Answer you in your
 “own Language. If an [*Arian* Baptiz’d] Laick
 “Confesses that he has Err’d; How do’s he con-
 “tinue (in the State of) a [Baptiz’d] Laick? Let
 “him lay aside his Laical Priesthood, that is, the
 “Baptism [which he receiv’d,] and I also grant
 “Pardon to the Penitent, &c. ——— What-
 “soever is Unlawful for a Christian, is as much
 “Unlawful for a Laick as for a Bishop. He
 “that repents, condemns his former Crimes. If
 “it is not Lawful for a Penitent [*Arian*] Bishop
 “to continue [a Bishop] as he was before; then
 “also, it is not Lawful for a Penitent [*Arian*]
 “Laick to remain in the State [of Baptism which
 “he receiv’d in *Arianism*,] for which he now re-
 “pents.

(6) *Lucif.* “We receive [Penitent *Arian*]
 “Laicks, because none of them would be Conver-
 “ted, if they knew that they were to be Re-bap-
 “tiz’d; and so we should be the Cause of their
 “Perdition, if we should not allow of the Bap-
 “tism they receiv’d of the *Arian* Clergy.

(5) *Orthod.* Respondebo tibi & Ego sermonibus tuis, si Lai-
 cus errasse se confitetur, quomodo Laicus perseverat? Deponat
 Sacerdotium Laici, i. e. Baptisma, & ego do veniam poenitenti.
 Scriptum este nim regnum quoque, nos & Sacerdotes Deo Patri suo
 fecit. (*Apoc.* i. 6.) omne quod non licet Christiano, Communé
 est tam Episcopo quam Laico. Qui poenitentiam agit, priora
 condemnat. Si non licet Episcopo poenitenti perseverare quod
 fuerat, non licet & Laico poenitenti permanere in eo, propter
 quod poenitentiam confitetur.

(6) *Lucif.* Recipimus Laicos, quoniam nemo convertetur, si
 se scierit Re-baptizandum, & ita fiet ut nos simus causa perditionis
 eorum si repudientur.

(7) *Orthod.*

(7) *Orthod.* “ — [As for us,] we do not act
 “ inconsistently with our selves; for we either re-
 “ ceive the Bishop, with the People whom he Baptiz'd;
 “ or if we do not receive the Bishop [as such,] we
 “ know, that his People also must be rejected, [i. e.
 “ not receiv'd as Baptiz'd Laicks.] — “ There-
 “ fore, I pray you, That you either allow him to
 “ sacrifice, (i. e. to be a Priest, having Power to
 “ administer the Sacrifice of the Eucharist) “ whose
 “ Baptism [administred by him] you allow of;
 “ or else reject that Baptism which was admi-
 “ nistred by him, who you do not esteem to be a
 “ Priest.

(8) *Lucif.* “ [Tho' I allow of the Baptism he
 “ administred,] yet the Laick he baptiz'd, I re-
 “ ceive (upon his Repentance) by Imposition of
 “ Hands, and Invocation of the Holy-Ghost; be-
 “ cause I know, that the Gift of the Holy-Ghost
 “ cannot be conferr'd by Hereticks.

(9) *Orthod.* “ When a Man is baptiz'd [as he
 “ is among the Arians] into or in the Name of the
 “ Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost; he is then made
 “ the Temple of the Lord, a new Temple of the
 “ Holy Trinity. How can you say, that among
 “ the

(7) *Orthod.*— Nos nobis adversa non facimus: Aut Episcopum cum populo recipimus quem facit Christianum, aut si Episcopum non recipimus, scimus etiam nobis populum rejiciendum— Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas cujus Baptisma probas: Aut reprobes ejus Baptisma quem non existimas Sacerdotem. —

(8) *Lucif.* Sed ego recipio Laicum pœnitentem, per manus impositionem & invocationem Spiritus Sancti, Sciens ab Hoereticis Spiritum Sanctum non posse conferri.

(9) *Orthod.*—Quum in Patre, & Filio & Spiritu Sancto Baptizatus homo Templum Domini fiat, quum veteri æde destructa novum Trinitatis delubrum ædificetur, quomodo dicis sine ad-
 ventu

“ the *Arians*, Sins may be remitted, without the
 “ Descent of the Holy-Ghost? ——— [for Bap-
 tism is for the Remission of Sins.] ——— “ It is
 “ evident, that there is no True Baptism without
 “ the Holy-Ghost. ——— If an *Arian* cannot
 “ give the Holy-Ghost, he cannot truly Baptize;
 “ because, without the Holy-Ghost, there is no
 “ True Baptism of the Church: Therefore, when
 “ you receive a Person baptiz’d by an *Arian*, and
 “ call on the Holy-Ghost to descend on him; either
 “ you ought to baptize him, because he could not
 “ be baptiz’d before without the Holy-Ghost; or,
 “ if he was at first baptiz’d in the Spirit, then
 “ forbear to call on the Spirit to descend on him,
 “ since he receiv’d the Holy-Ghost when he was
 “ baptiz’d.

(10) *Lucif.* “ But pray, have you not read in
 “ the Acts of the Apostles, That they who had
 “ been before baptiz’d by *John* the Baptist, when
 “ they answer’d to the Apostle’s Question, that they
 “ had not so much as heard whether there was any
 “ Holy-Ghost, did afterwards obtain the Gift of

ventu Spiritus Sancti apud Arianos peccata posse dimitti?—
 Apparet Baptisma non esse sine Spiritu Sancto.——

Si Arianus Spiritum Sanctum non potest Dare, ne Baptizare qui-
 dem potest, quia Ecclesiæ Baptisma sine Spiritu Sancto nullum
 est. Tu vero quum Baptizatum ab eo recipias, & postea
 invoces Spiritum Sanctum, aut Baptizare eum debes quia sine
 Spiritu Sancto non potuit Baptizari; aut si est Baptizatus in
 Spiritu, desine ei invocare Spiritum, quem tunc quum Baptiza-
 retur accepit.

(10) *Lucif.* Obsecro te, nonne legisti in actibus Apostolorum,
 eos qui jam à Johanne Baptizati fuerant, quum ad interroga-
 tionem Apostoli respondissent, se nec auditu quidem comparisse,
 quid esset Spiritus Sanctus, postea fuisse Spiritum Sanctum conse-
 quutos? Unde manifestum est, posse aliquem Baptizari, & tamen
 non habere Spiritum Sanctum.

“ the

“ the Holy-Ghost? Whence it is manifest, that a
 “ Person may be baptiz’d, and yet not have the
 “ Holy-Ghost.

(11) *Orthod.* — But Paul said to those
 same Persons, “ *John indeed Baptiz’d the People*
 “ *with the Baptism of Repentance, saying, that they*
 “ *should believe on him who was to come after him,*
 “ *that is, on Jesus, for the Remission of Sins. And*
 “ *when they had heard these things they were bap-*
 “ *tiz’d in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ; and*
 “ *when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy-*
 “ *Ghost immediately fell on them, Acts xix. 1, &c.*
 “ If they therefore were baptiz’d with the True
 “ and Lawful Baptism of the Church, and so did
 “ afterwards obtain the Holy-Ghost; do you also
 “ follow the Rule of the Apostles, baptize those
 “ who have not Christ’s Baptism, [*i. e.* the Laicks
 baptiz’d by *Arians*, who you say are not Priests]
 “ and then [when you have given them Christ’s
 Baptism] “ you may call on the Holy-Ghost to
 “ descend on them.

(12) *Lucif.* — “ But do you not know, that this
 “ is the Custom of the Churches, *viz.* that the Bi-

(11) *Orthod.* — *Dixit autem Paulus: Johannes quidem Baptizavit*
Baptismo Pœnitentiæ Plebem, dicens in advenientem post eum ut cre-
derent, hoc est in Jesum, in remissionem peccatorum. His auditis Bap-
tizati sunt in Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi. Et quum imposuisset
illis manus Paulus, continuo cecidit Spiritus Sanctus super eos.
 Si ergo Baptizati sunt, vero & legitimo Ecclesiæ Baptizmate,
 & ita postea Spiritum Sanctum consequuti sunt; & tu Aposto-
 lorum sequere auctoritatem, & Baptiza eos, qui Christi non
 habent Baptisma, & poteris invocare Spiritum Sanctum.

(12) *Lucif.* — An nescis etiam Ecclesiarum hunc esse morem,
 ut Baptizatis postea manus imponantur, & ita invocetur Spiritus
 Sanctus? Exigis ubi Scriptum sit? In actibus Apostolorum.

“shop should lay his Hands on those who have
 “been already baptiz’d, and call on the Holy-
 “Ghost to descend on them? Do you demand
 “where this is written? ’Tis in the Acts of the
 “Apostles.

(13) *Orthod.* “Truly I do not deny that this
 “is the Custom of the Churches, that, when Per-
 “sons have been baptiz’d by Presbyters and Dea-
 “cons, at a great Distance, in small Cities [where
 Bishops do not reside] “the Bishop should come
 “and lay his Hands on them, with Invocation of
 “the Holy-Ghost.——But if you now enquire,
 “why a Person baptiz’d in the Church may not
 “receive the Holy-Ghost, but by Imposition of the
 “Hands of the Bishop, when we assert that the
 “Holy-Ghost is also given in True Baptism: You
 “are to understand, that this Custom descends to

(13) *Orthod.* Non quidem abnuo hanc esse Ecclesiarum con-
 suetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per Presby-
 teros & Diaconos baptizati sunt, Episcopus ad invocationem Sancti
 Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat.——Quod si hoc loco
 quæris; Quare in Ecclesia Baptizatus, nisi per manus Episcopi,
 non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, quem nos asserimus in vero
 Baptizmate tribui: Disce, hanc observationem, ex ea auctoritate
 descendere, quod post ascensum Domini, Spiritus Sanctus ad apo-
 stolos descendit. Et multis in locis idem factitatum reperimus, ad
 honorem potius Sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis. Alioqui
 si ad Episcopi tantum imprecationem Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lu-
 gendi sunt qui in lectulis, &c. per Presbyteros & Diaconos bap-
 tizati, ante dormierunt quam ab Episcopis inviserentur. Ecclesie
 salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet: Cui si non exors quæ-
 dam, & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis
 efficientur Schismata quot Sacerdotes. Inde venit, ut sine Chris-
 mate & Episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus jus
 habeant baptizandi. Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit,
 scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita & dare
 potest, &c.

“ us from this Authority, that after our Lord’s
 “ Ascension, the Holy-Ghost came down on the
 “ Apostles. And in many Places we find the
 “ same Custom [*viz.* of Conferring the Holy-
 Ghost on baptiz’d Persons by Imposition of the
 Bishop’s Hands] “ to be observ’d rather for the
 “ Honour of the [Bishop’s] Priesthood, than for
 “ any Law of Necessity. Otherwise, if the Holy-
 “ Ghost descends by reason of the Bishop’s Prayer
 “ only; then they are to be bewail’d who were
 “ baptiz’d in their Beds, &c. by Presbyters and
 “ Deacons, and dy’d before they could be visited
 “ by the Bishops. The Safety of the Church de-
 “ pends on the Dignity of the High-Priest, [*i. e.*
 the Bishop] “ to whom, if there were not given
 “ some certain Power and Authority, not to be
 “ shared in by others, but Eminent above all,
 “ there would be as many Schisms and Divisions in
 “ the Churches as Priests. Hence it comes to pass,
 “ that without the Chrism and Consent of the Bi-
 “ shop, neither Presbyter nor Deacon have Autho-
 “ rity to Baptize: Which for all that, if Necessi-
 “ ty compels, we know is frequently Lawful for
 “ Laicks. For even as a Man receives, so he
 “ can give to others the Thing he receiv’d.

Note here, ’Tis very remarkable, that in this
 last Answer of the Catholick, Saint *Jerom*
 strangely brings in the Notion of the Lawful-
 ness of Baptism by Laicks in Cases of Extre-
 mity, without any Connection or Reference
 to his former or following Discourse, but in-
 deed inconsistently with his Argument against
 the *Luciferian*; I say inconsistently, because
 the *Luciferian*, upon this Principle, might
 have overthrown *Orthodox*’s whole Argument;

for 'twould have been very natural for the *Luciferian* to have answer'd, " You say that I
 " must reject a Baptism administer'd by One
 " whom I do not esteem to be a Priest. [See Or-
 " thodox, p. 127.] I say that I am not oblig'd
 " to reject such a Baptism; because, upon your
 " own Principle, and also that of the Catholick
 " Church, [if this Principle was Hers] Laicks
 " may Lawfully baptize in Case of Extremity,
 " where Priests are not to be had; the Arian
 " Priest, whom I esteem to be No Priest, bap-
 " tiz'd the Arian Laick; the Arian Laick
 " could get no other Baptism under his Circum-
 " stances, therefore the Baptism he receiv'd was
 " a Baptism in Necessity perform'd by a Lay-
 " man, according to my Opinion, and good by
 " your Principle; consequently tho' I allow of
 " the Baptism, I am not oblig'd to acknowledge
 " him for a Priest, viz. the Arian Priest who
 " administer'd it." This would have been a
 very natural Retort upon St. *Ferom*, if his
 singular Notion of the Lawfulness of Laicks
 baptizing in Cases of Necessity, had been then
 the General Sense and Practice of the Church;
 but the *Luciferian's* next Subsequent Answer
 shews that he had no Knowledge of any such
 Notion; that he took no notice at all of St. *Ferom's*
 advancing it, and therefore 'tis unac-
 countable how St. *Ferom* brought it into his
 Discourse, when it had no dependance at all
 upon his Argument; but is inconsistent with
 it, and even destructive of that Catholick
 Principle, upon which he was endeavouring
 to Confute the Practice of the *Luciferians*.
 But to proceed; the *Luciferian*, without
 taking any notice of St. *Ferom's* Saying about
 Laicks

Laicks baptizing; as if it was a singular Notion that would do him no Service in his Dispute with *Orthodox*, answers thus:

(14) *Lucif.* “ Be it so, viz. that among the
 “ *Arians* there is indeed no Baptism, and that
 “ therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be given by
 “ them, because they have not yet receiv’d Remis-
 “ sion of Sins; all this helps much towards my
 “ gaining the Victory.——An *Arian* is not
 “ baptiz’d, how then can he be a Priest? Among
 “ them there is not a baptiz’d Lay-man, how then
 “ can there be a Bishop? &c.

(15) *Orthod.* “ I do not at present so much re-
 “ proach, or defend the *Arians*, as I endeavour to con-
 “ vince you. For the same reason that you receive a

(14) *Lucif.*—Esto quippe apud Arianos ne Baptisma quidem esse, & ideo Spiritum Sanctum ab eis non posse dari quia necdum remissionem peccatorum acceperint, totum hoc victoriæ meæ prodest, & argumentorum tuorum palestra mihi palmam victoriæ sudat. Arianus Baptisma non habet & quomodo Sacerdotium habet? Laicus apud eos non est & quomodo Episcopus esse potest? Mihi recipere mendicum non licet, tu recipis regem? Vos hosti castra traditis, & à nobis perfuga rejiciendus est?

(15) *Orthod.* Ego—non tam in præsentì Arianos vel improbo, vel defendo, quam illam cursus mei metam circumeo, eadem ratione à nobis Episcopum recipi, qua Laicus à vobis recipitur. Si erranti concedis veniam; & ego ignosco poenitenti. Si in fide sua baptizato baptizans nocere non potuit, & in fide sua Sacerdotem constitutum constituens non inquinavit. Subtilis est Hæresis, & ideo simplices animæ facile decipiuntur. Deceptio tam Laici quam Episcopi Communis est: — Igitur parvulorum inter se certantium ritu, quidquid dixeris dicam: Affirmabis, affirmabo; negabis, negabo. Arianus Baptizat; Ergo Episcopus est: Non Baptizat; tu refuta Laicum, & ego non recipio Sacerdotem. Sequar te quoquumque ieris, aut pariter in luto hæsitabimus, aut pariter expediemur.

“ Penitent [*Arian* Laick] we receive a Penitent
 “ [*Arian* Bishop.] If you grant Pardon to the
 “ Laick who Err’d; I also Forgive the Penitent
 “ Bishop. If the *Baptizer* could not hurt him
 “ whom he baptiz’d, in his *false* Faith, then he
 “ who ordained, did not defile the Priest whom he
 “ ordain’d, in his *false* Faith. Heresy is a subtil
 “ thing, and therefore simple Souls are easily de-
 “ ceiv’d. Bishops, as well as Laicks, are Lyable
 “ to be Deceiv’d. ————— Therefore, as Children use
 “ to do when striving with one another, whatso-
 “ ever you shall say, I will say; what you shall
 “ affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will
 “ deny. [If you say that] an *Arian* Bishop bap-
 “ tizes, [and this you must say, if you receive Lay-
 “ repenting *Arians* without Re-baptizing them] “ I
 “ say he is therefore a Bishop. [If you say] he do’s
 “ not baptize, then I say, do you Convince the
 “ Laick [that he receiv’d no Baptism from the
 “ *Arian* Bishop] “ and I disapprove of the Priest-
 “ hood of him who baptized. I will follow you
 “ whithersoever you shall go; either we will both
 “ together stick in the Mud, or we will equally
 “ get clear out of it.

(16) *Lucif.* “ But a Laick ought therefore to
 “ be pardon’d, because in his Simplicity, thinking
 “ the *Arians* to be the Church of God, he ap-
 “ ply’d to them; and believing, was, according
 “ to his own Faith, baptiz’d.

(16) *Lucif.* Sed Laico ideo ignoscendum est, quia Ecclesiam
 Dei putans simpliciter accessit, & juxta fidem suam credens bap-
 tizatus est.

(17) *Or.*

(17) *Orthod.* “ You assert a new Thing, that
 “ any One may be made a Christian, by him who
 “ is no Christian himself. Into what Faith is he
 “ baptiz’d, that goes over to the *Arians*? Certain-
 “ ly into the Faith of the *Arians*.

(18) *Lucif.* ——— “ A Laick baptiz’d in
 “ Faith, even out of the Church, is receiv’d to
 “ Communion upon his Repentance. But a Bishop
 “ either does not do Penance because he is a Priest,
 “ or if he does Penance he ceases to be a Bishop;
 “ wherefore we rightly receive a Penitent *Arian*
 “ Laick, and we reject an *Arian* Bishop if he will
 “ continue in his Priesthood.

(19) *Orthod.* “ Our Question now, is not, Whe-
 “ ther a Bishop can undergo Penance, as a Laick
 “ may; but, Whether the Lay-Heretick has re-
 “ ceiv’d Baptism, who, if (as ’tis plain) he has
 “ not Baptism, how can he be a Penitent before he
 “ is a Christian? Prove to me, that a Laick com-
 “ ing from the *Arians*, is baptiz’d, and I will not
 “ deny him Penance; but if he is not a Christian,
 “ if

(17) *Orthod.* Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non fuit Christianus. Accedens ad Arianos, in qua fide baptizatus est? Nempe in ea quam habebant Ariani.

(18) *Lucif.*— Laicus etiam extra Ecclesiam fide baptizatus pœnitens recipitur. Episcopus vero, aut pœnitentiam non agit, & sacerdos est, aut si pœnitentiam egerit esse Episcopus desinit. Quamobrem recte nos laicum & suscipimus pœnitentem, & Episcopum si in Sacerdotio perseverare vult, repudiamus.

(19) *Orthod.* ——— Neque enim hoc modo quæritur: An Episcopus Pœnitens esse non possit, & laicus possit? Sed an Hæreticus baptisma habeat? qui si ut constat baptisma non habet, quomodo potest esse pœnitens antequam Christianus? Proba mihi ab arianis venientem Laicum habere Baptismum, & tunc ei pœnitentiam non negabo. Si vero Christianus non est, si non

“ if he had not a Priest who could make him a
 “ Christian, [as 'tis plain he had not, if we deny
 the Orders of the *Arian* Clergy] “ how shall a
 “ Man be admitted to do Penance, who is not yet
 “ a Christian ?

(20) *Lucif.* “ Do's it then seem reasonable to
 “ you, that an *Arian* should be a Bishop ?

(21) *Orthod.* “ You your self allow him to be
 “ a Bishop, by your receiving an *Arian* Laick
 “ baptiz'd by him, [and thereby you acknowledge
 the Validity of his Orders, because you do not
 reject, but allow of the Baptism which the Laick
 receiv'd from him] “ and in this you are to be
 “ reprov'd. Why you do separate from our Com-
 “ munion, when you not only agree with us in
 “ Faith, but in receiving of Hereticks also ?——
 “ For I receive [*as a Bishop*] an *Arian* Bishop,
 “ coming over from the *Arians* to the Church ; up-
 “ on the very same Principle that you receive [*as*
 a Lay-Christian] “ an *Arian*-Laick baptiz'd by
 “ him.——We agree in the Faith, we agree in
 “ receiving Hereticks, let us also agree in One
 “ and the Same Communion.

habuerit Sacerdotem, qui eum faceret Christianum, quomodo
 aget pœnitentiam Homo qui necdum credit ?

(20) *Lucif.* ——— Æquumne tibi videtur, ut Arianus
 Episcopus sit ?

(21) *Orthod.* Tu eum Episcopum probas, qui ab eo recipis
 Baptizatum ; & in hoc reprehendendus es. Quare a nobis parietibus
 separaris, quum in fide & in Arianorum nobiscum receptione
 consentias ? ——— Eadem enim ratione Episcopum ab arianis
 recipio, qua tu recipis Baptizatum. ——— Consentimus in
 fide, Consentimus in Hæreticis recipiendis, Consentiamus etiam
 in Conventu.

(22) *Lucif.*

(22) *Lucif.* “ — Behold, I give way, I submit, and acknowledge that you have Conquer’d me *.

Thus much may suffice to shew the Catholick Principle insisted on by St. *Jerom* in this Dialogue; I have not always confin’d my self to the very Letter of the Words, but expatiated sometimes by way of Paraphrase, that the Sense and Meaning of the Dispute against the *Luciferians*, might be the more Evident to the *English* Reader; and that he might be thereby the more enabled to see the Truth of what I have before asserted, and here repeat again, *viz.* That the Great Argument, by which the *Luciferian* was Convinc’d, was, That If the *Luciferians* rejected the Orders of the *Arian* Clergy, they ought also to reject the Baptisms administer’d by them; but the *Luciferians* in their Practice, allow’d of those Baptisms, because they admitted *Arian* Repentant-Laicks to Communion, without re-baptizing them; and therefore the *Luciferians* were bound to acknowledge the Priestly Power of the *Arian* Clergy, who baptiz’d those Laicks: This is so plain, in the Dialogue before us, that he who runs may read it; and the whole Argument turns upon this, That where there is not a Priestly Power, there is No True Baptism administer’d; for, says *Orthodox*,

(22) *Lucif.* En tollo manus, cedo, vicisti. —

* *S. Hieronymus adversus Luciferianos*, p. 290. &c.
Opera, Tom. IV. Paris 1706.

N^o 7. “ If we do not receive the [Arian] Bishop [as a Bishop] “ we know that the People [baptiz’d by him] “ must also be rejected,” [not receiv’d as baptiz’d Laicks.]

——“ Reject that Baptism which was administer’d by him, whom you do not esteem to be a Priest.

N^o 15. “ An Arian Bishop baptizes, therefore he is a Bishop. If he does not, i. e. cannot baptize, I disapprove of his Priesthood.

N^o 19. “ If an Arian Laick, had not a Priest, “ who could make him a Christian; how should he [be admitted to] do Penance, viz. the Arian Laick, who is not yet a Christian.

N^o 21. “ You your self approve an Arian to be a Bishop, by your receiving an Arian Laick baptiz’d by him, &c.

By such Arguments as these, *Orthodox* asserts against the *Luciferian*, that the *Arian* Clergy were not Lay-men, but had Priestly Power: He concludes the Validity of their Priesthood from the Validity of the Baptism they administer’d: He asserts, that if they had no Priesthood, the Baptism administer’d by them ought to be rejected. And to this, as to an Invincible Argument, the *Luciferian* submitted, and was overcome by the force thereof; and consequently St. *Jerom* here confuted the *Luciferian*, by insisting upon a then known Principle of the Invalidity of Baptism perform’d by Persons destitute of a Priestly Power; and so is an Evidence of the Church’s Sense in those Days, against the Validity of our pretended Baptisms, perform’d by those who certainly were never vested

vested with any such Power and Authority, as our Dissenters 'tis evident never were.

And for a further Confirmation of this, let it be observ'd, that St. *Jerom* in the same Dialogue, do's afterwards, towards the Conclusion, expressly affirm, That, * *Without Priests there is no Church*; which would be a Notorious Falsity, if in his Days, it was a *Just and Sound Principle* of the Catholick Church, that Persons who never were Priests in any respect whatsoever, could minister Valid Baptism, for where there is Valid Baptism there is most certainly a Church; because, Baptism is Our Admission *into the Church*: And so, without Priests, there would be a Church, which is contrary to this Father. St. *Jerom* do's here therefore Null all pretended Baptism by Persons that are *Not Priests*, because [according to him] where there is No Priest there is No Church; and certainly if there is No Church (*i. e.* where there is No Priest) there is No Baptism: And if no Baptism, then the pretended Baptisms of such *No Priests*, are Null and Void, if this Father may be suppos'd to be Consistent with himself in this and the rest of his Assertions against the *Luciferian* Schismatick.

We have seen, in the Course of this *Dialogue*, that St. *Jerom* made a Slip, when he said, That in Cases of Necessity 'twas lawful for Laicks to Baptize; we have observ'd how inconsistent this is with the whole Scope of his Argument against the Schismatics, whom he was endeavouring to convert upon Catholick Principles; that it is very oddly, and without any Connection, brought into a

* *Ecclesia autem non est, quæ non habet Sacerdotes. S. Hieron. Oper. Tom. IV. adver. Lucif. 302. Paris 1706.*

Discourse of another Nature, and which was made on a quite contrary Principle and Foundation. It is also plain, from what has been largely said before, *Page 121, &c.* that this of the Lawfulness of Laicks baptizing, was not the then general Sense and Practice of the Church; and that let it be taken in what tolerable Sense it will, our Lay-Baptisms receive no Countenance from it: And lastly, That the very Foundation, upon which *St. Jerom* supposes Laicks Baptism to be Lawful, is false in Fact, and dangerous to other Sacred Institutions, as well as to that of Baptism; and therefore upon the whole we may venture to say, That if our Reverend Historian had but thoroughly read over, and duly consider'd *St. Jerom's* Dialogue, he might have been convinced that he had no reason to censure [as he do's] Two such Excellent and Learned Men as *Dr. Forbes*, and *Mr. Reeves*, and in so publick a Manner too, [in his 33d and 34th Pages] as guilty of Error and Mistake, for affirming, That "*after the Council of Nice, this Proposition, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptiz'd, was look'd upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted Principle whereby the Orthodox confuted the Luciferians.*" For by the Dialogue we plainly see that it was so; and it is to be wonder'd how it comes to pass, that one so well vers'd "*in Greek and Latin Fathers*" as our Reverend Historian is, do's not see it too.

Mr. Bingham says, *pag. 34.* "*Who that reads these Words [viz. after the Council of Nice, &c.] in these Learned Writers [i. e. Dr. Forbes, and Mr. Reeves] would not at first sight be tempted to think, that the Council of Nice had somewhere made an Order, that Persons baptiz'd by Lay-men should be re-baptiz'd; and that the Catholicks gene-*"
 rally

“ *rally made use of this, as an undoubted Principle,*
“ *to confute the Luciferians?* ” What a strange In-
sinuation is this, against the Ingenuity and Integrity of those Two Learned Gentlemen! Would Mr. *Bingham* take it kindly to be serv’d thus himself? I appeal to his own Conscience, whether he himself believes, that those *Excellent* Persons had any such design in their Words, as to make the World believe, that the Council of *Nice* made such an Order. Who but the Careless, &c. would, in reading those Learned Mens Words, “ *be at first sight* ”
“ *tempted to think* ” any such thing? If Men, “ *at first sight,* ” are apt to be heedless, let ’em look again, and then they’ll find that, as second Thoughts are often best, so is a second Inspection. Mr. *Bingham* knows, that before his Scholastical History came forth, there were Men, who pleaded the Authority of “ *Ancient Catholick Tradition* ” for the Validity of Lay-Baptism, particularly the corrupt Church of *Rome*, and others, tho’ not of her Communion, yet *so far* however agreeing with her in *Popery*: He knows that the Plea of Antiquity is a very powerful Motive, to cause some Men to believe Doctrines and Practices; Dr. *Forbes* and Mr. *Reeves*, no doubt, had an eye to this, in the Question of Lay-Baptism; and they have prov’d to the World, that the pretended Validity of Baptism by Lay-men, was not so old a Doctrine as some Men represent it: The particular Instance here produc’d by them, shews, that even after the first 300 Years of Christianity, it was not known in the general Sense and Practice of the Church, but that the very contrary was held by the Catholics in the Fourth Century; because, when the *Luciferian* Schismatics separated themselves from the Communion of the Church, which they did
“ *after*

“ *after the Council of Nice* ” [held A. C. 325.] The Orthodox confuted those *Luciferians* by this “ *undoubted Principle, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptiz’d.* ” This St. *Ferom* asserted so late, as, in the Year 384, long after the Council of Nice. This the *Luciferian* Schismatick could not gainsay, but submitted to it, as is evident from the before-mentioned *Dialogue*— And this being “ *after the Council of Nice,* ” ’twas highly reasonable for those Learned Men to say, That ’twas so ; because thereby we may discover, not only the Novelty of the Notion of Lay-Baptisms being Valid, but also, that [notwithstanding the * Council of Nice had decreed, that the Orders of the *Novatian* Schismaticks were good and valid yet] the Orthodox did not believe any thing done that Council could favour the Validity of Lay-Baptisms, tho’ some of the Favourers of those false Baptisms might, from this Councils Act about the *Novatian* Schismaticks, falsely infer the Validity of such Baptisms, since ’tis notorious that some reckon (as Mr. *Bingham* very well knows) Lay-Baptism, and the Ancient Schismatical Baptism, to be much of the same Nature ; but of this more hereafter. And these may be the Reasons why those Excellent Writers say, and that very truly too, That “ † *after the Council of Nice, this Proposition, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptized ; was look’d upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted Principle, whereby the Orthodox confuted the Luciferians.* ” But for a further

* Canon 8.

† *Forbes’s Instruct. Histor. Lib. 10. Cap. 14. N. 5.*
Reeves’s Note on Vincentius Lirin. p. 263.

Vindication of those Two Learned and Judicious Writers, I refer the Reader to the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Bret*, who has abundantly prov'd Mr. *Bingham*, and not those Excellent Persons, to be mistaken in this Matter, as may be seen in that Learned Doctor's "*Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Primitive Church, in relation to Persons being Baptiz'd by Lay-men,*" from pag. 30, to 40.

§ XXVIII. St. *Augustin* comes next under our Consideration. Mr. *Bingham* says of him thus, in pag. 34. He "was Co-temporary with St. *Jerom*,
"and of the same Opinion with him in this Mat-
"ter. In his Epistle to *Fortunatus*, which is pre-
"serv'd in **Gratian*, he says, *In time of Necessity,*
"when a Bishop or Presbyter, or other Minister,
"could not be found, and a Man desir'd Baptism,
"who was in danger of Death, in that case Lay-
"men were used to give him that Sacrament
"which they had receiv'd, rather than he should end
"his Life without it."

But in Answer to this, it is to be observ'd, That Mr. *Bingham*, in translating this Passage, is more positive, and thereby induces his *English* Reader to believe, much more than the *Latin* will allow; for according to this Translation, it looks as if St. *Augustin* assur'd us, That 'twas Matter of Fact, that in such a "*Case, Lay-men were used to Give*
"that Sacrament," &c. whereas, in truth, it was to St. *Augustin* himself a *Hear-say* only: He do's not tell this, as if himself were an Evidence of the Truth of it, but that it was reported so; his

* Ap. *Gratian* de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 21.

Words are these, as Mr. Bingham has 'em in his Margin : “ *In Necessitate, cum ——— urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto Sacramento hanc vitam fineat, etiam Laicos solere dare Sacramentum quod acceperunt, Solemus Audire. We use to Hear, that, In time of Necessity, &c. Lay-men are used to give that Sacrament,*” &c. St. Augustin, [if those are his Words] do's not say, (as Mr. Bingham represents it) That Lay-men were us'd to give that Sacrament ; but only gives us to understand, that there us'd to be such Reports. Now what does this signifie, towards clearing the Matter we are enquiring after? If such Reports were spread Abroad, and came to St. Augustin's Ear ; do's it therefore follow, that the Thing reported was true, and that it was also the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church ? Must we have no better Proofs for her *General Sense and Practice*, than such Hear-say Stories ? If Mr. Bingham do's not give us better Evidence than this, the World will easily see through the Falacy : And 'tis very unaccountable, for a Man of that Gentleman's Character and Function, to make his *English* Reader believe, that St. Augustin himself says (in this Place) that Lay-men did Baptize ; when in truth he only says, “ *We use to Hear*” so.

But our Reverend Historian goes on, and tells us from Gratian, That “ This Custom St. Augustin founds upon Authority, descended by Bishops from the Apostles ; for in the same * Epistle he

* Ap. Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 36. Sanctum est Baptisma per se ipsum, quod datum est in Nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti: Ita ut in eodem Sacramento sit etiam auctoritas Traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos, per illos autem ad Episcopos, & alios sacerdotes, vel etiam Laicos Christianos ab eadem Origine & Stirpe venientes.

[i. e. *St. Augustin*] says, "*Baptism is Holy in it self,*
 " *if it be given In the Name of the Father, Son, and*
 " *Holy-Ghost : And there is in this Sacrament the*
 " *Authority of the Commission, which our Saviour*
 " *gave to the Apostles, and by them to Bishops, and*
 " *other Priests, and even to Lay-men descending from*
 " *the same Stock and Original.*" This Translation
 do's not give the full, plain Sense of the Words, as
Gratian has transcrib'd them; they ought rather
 to be translated thus, that the *English* Reader may
 see the true Meaning of them: "*Baptism is Holy*
 " *in it self, if it be given In the Name of the Father,*
 " *Son, and Holy-Ghost ; [Ita ut in eodem Sacra-*
 " *mento sit etiam Auctoritas, &c.] So that there*
 " *be also in this Sacrament, the Authority of the*
 " *Commission which our Saviour gave to the Apostles,*
 " *and by them to Bishops and other Priests, and even*
 " *to Christian Lay-men descending from the same Stock*
 " *and Original.*" This Passage shews, that the
 Baptism which is *Holy in it self*, must not only be
 given in the Name of the Trinity, but must also
 have the **Authority of Christ's Commission.**
 Now if this Commission was really given to Chri-
 stian Lay-men by the Apostles, as *Gratian* here
 makes *St. Augustin* suppose it was, (tho' *St. Au-*
gustin never did prove any such thing, nor indeed
 any other Writer whatsoever, either before or after
 him;) I say, supposing Lay-men could really have
 this Commission; yet still 'tis notorious, that Our
 Lay-men about whom we Dispute, never had any
 such Commission at all; and therefore, whatsoever
 may be pleaded from this Passage, for Baptisms
 by such *supposedly-Commission'd Lay-men*, can no-
 ways be apply'd to the pretended Baptisms per-
 form'd by our *Laicks*, who have not the least ap-
 pearance

pearance of any such *supposed* Commission ever given to them.

To this may be added another Passage which *Gratian* attributes to *St. Augustin*; * "*Baptism is not such as he is who ministers it, but such as He is [i.e. Christ] by whose Power and Authority it is given,*" &c. From hence it follows, that the pretended Baptism given by our Laicks is no *Christian Baptism*, because it is not perform'd by *Christ's Power and Authority*: He by whose Authority they give it, is *nothing but a common unconsecrated Person*: Such as he is, such is the pretended Baptism they give; therefore 'tis Nothing but a common Washing, because he is Nothing but a common Person: For our Laicks pretended Power and Authority, is receiv'd by them from No One whatsoever, that is consecrated to give them a valid Power; and consequently their Washings perform'd by Authority of an unconsecrated common Person, are Not *Christian Baptism*, but common Washings only. But to proceed,

Mr. Bingham, in his 35th and 36th Pages, next tells us out of *Gratian*, that *St. Augustin* "*relates a Story of a certain Catechumen, who being at Sea, and in danger of being cast away in a Storm, was baptiz'd by a Penitent, because there was no other Christian in the Ship with them;*" and that *St. Augustin* concludes upon it, "*That tho' such a Fact had not happen'd, yet it was a Case that every*

* Baptismus talis est, qualis ille est in cujus potestate datur, non qualis est ille per cujus ministerium datur. Augustin super Joannem in parte prima, *Tract. 5. ad Cap. 1. apud Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. xxvi.*

“ one must own might happen; and then No One
 “ could say, that in such a Case a Man who desired
 “ Baptism in imminent danger of Death, was to be
 “ deserted, and left unbaptiz’d.

But to do justice to this Passage, and to the Reader too, I will give him a little further insight into the Credit of this *supposed Fact*, than our Reverend Historian has thought fit to do: It is then very true, that *Gratian* makes *St. Augustin* relate such a Story; but ’tis also as true, that the same *Gratian* makes *St. Augustin* say of this Story thus,
 “ * If any one refuses to believe what I have related,
 “ (for it is not founded on Authority of the Holy
 “ Scriptures, but reported by an unknown doubt-
 “ ful Author) I will not thwart him.” This plainly discovers that *St. Augustin* himself, [if he did relate such a Story] had no Foundation whereon to rely for the Truth of it; ’twas by his own Confession only a Report, and the Author of it **Not Known**, therefore not to be depended on: He did not think it to be of such Importance as to be insisted on; no, he would not Oppose any One that refus’d to believe it: So that, here we are amus’d with a Story of No Moment, a Thing only in the Air, of no weight, but a very Trifle, not worth our Notice. *St. Augustin* is made, however, to say, that this “ was a Case that every one

* Quod si forte hoc quod narravi, &c. — Non vult aliquis credere (non enim hoc Scripturarum Divinarum auctoritas, sed incerto auctore fama commendat) non repugnabo: sed interrogabo, si tale aliquid contingat, quid futurum est? Non enim potest quisquam dicere relinquendum esse illum qui morte imminente baptizari desiderat. Quem Baptizatum a poenitente quisquis non credit Contigisse oportet ut Credat posse contingere. Apud *Gratian* de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 36.

“*must own might happen;*” and what then? What signifies the Possibility of such a Case? Our Inquiry is after *Matters of Fact*, attested to by the Ancient Catholick Church. A Thousand ridiculous Cases are possible to happen; nay, some, (as we find by Experience) which are Superstitious even to a degree of Madness and Distraction, have happen’d; and some Popish Writers, &c. are full of Relations of such Accidents. But the Consequences and Inferences which are rais’d from ’em are not always *just* and good, but frequently *false*, and *repugnant* to the Laws both of God and Man.

Our suppos’d St. *Augustin* says, “*If any thing like this should happen, No One can say, that in such a Case, a Man who desires Baptism in imminent danger of Death, is to be deserted and left unbaptiz’d.*” This is very true, he ought not to be deserted, by those who have the *Power of Giving him Baptism*; but if there are none present, and no other to be procured, but Lay-hands, such as *never receiv’d the Power of Giving Baptism*, then ’tis Nonsense to say, that he is deserted by them who have it not in their Power to give him what he wants; [and to say that *Necessity* gives them this Power, is begging the Question] so that, if he dies unbaptiz’d, he is not *Deserted* and *Left* unbaptiz’d, but he is **taken away** unbaptiz’d. If in a desert Place I see a miserable Object, a Man dangerously wounded by Robbers, and wallowing in his Blood, ready to Expire; I search his Wound, and find it so large, as that ’tis out of my Power to close it up, or stop the Blood from issuing out of it; I can only Sympathize with the poor Man in his miserable desperate Case, and send up my Prayers to God for his departing Soul: He in this
Case

Case is not *sorsaken* by me, tho' he dies without that Relief which he wanted, and which I had not at all in my Power to administer to him. Or, suppose, which is a just Parallel to the Case before us; A Christian, who never receiv'd the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, upon the near Approach of Death, fears that he shall not be saved without it, and therefore with vehement Cries and Tears begs of me to procure him the Reception of it. We are very remote from any Place where Priests are to be had, and after all Diligence us'd, none can be procured to give it him; he is assur'd of this, but yet continues unsatisfied, and earnestly desires me to give it him, believing that in this Case it will be the same thing; I tell him 'tis utterly out of my Power, mine is an ineffective Hand, I never was vested with Christ's Authority, and therefore he would receive Nothing from me but Common, *Not Sacramental* Bread and Wine; however, I assist him with my charitable Prayers, &c. and he dies without receiving what I had no Power to give: 'Tis certain, the Man is not *Deserted* and *Left*, without the Sacrament, by me; God took him away from it, and to his most wise Disposal he must be left, as must all such unbaptiz'd Persons we are now speaking of; and if our suppos'd *St. Augustin* reckon'd, that, rather than leave them thus to God, any Christian present, had better minister Water to them, with the Form, In the Name of the Trinity; It is certain, that he only spoke dogmatically, giving but his own private Opinion in such a Case; for he refers us to no Law, no Canon, nor Custom of the Catholick Church for such a Practice.

Thus far may suffice in Answer to the Passages *Mr. Bingham* has produced out of *Gratian*, "a

“ Monk, who frequently quotes spurious * Books,
 “ as the genuine Writings of the Fathers:” And
 whose Authority, with relation to these Passages,
 is therefore so little to be rely’d on, that even our
 Reverend Historian himself intimates, that they
 may be question’d; and therefore, as not relying
 on them, he gives us a Quotation out of St. Au-
 gustin’s genuine Works, and says, pag. 36. “ But
 “ if any one thinks these Passages doubtful, because
 “ they are only related by Gratian, he may read
 “ the same in St. Augustin’s undoubted Works. In
 “ his Books against *Parmenian the Donatist*, he uses
 “ this Argument to prove, that the Baptism of
 “ Hereticks ought not to be repeated, viz. † Be-
 “ cause, tho’ it be but a Lay-man that gives Baptism
 “ to a Man in extream Necessity, when he is ready
 “ to Perish; he cannot think any one can piously
 “ say, that it ought to be repeated. If it be done
 “ without Necessity, it is indeed an Usurpation
 “ of another Man’s Office; but if he be compell’d by
 “ Necessity, it is either no Fault at all, or but a very
 “ light one.” This is Mr. Bingham’s Translation
 of St. Augustin’s Words; wherein ’tis very remark-
 able, that our Reverend Historian says of that Fa-
 ther, “ He cannot think any one can piously say,
 “ &c.” whereas in Truth, St. Augustin’s Words
 are, [“ *Nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repe-*
 “ *tendum*] I know not whether any One can pi-
 “ ously say that it ought to be repeated.” The

* Dr. Brett’s Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Pri-
 mitive Church, in relation to Persons baptiz’d by Lay-men, p. 42.

† Augustin. Contra Epistol. Parmen. Lib. 2. C. 13. Et si
 Laicus aliquis pereunti dederit, necessitate Compulsus, quod cum ipse
 acciperet dandum esse addidit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse
 repetendum, &c.

whole Passage then [to come as near as I can to Mr. Bingham's Translation, without doing any Violence to the Sense of St. *Augustin's* Words] is this, "If a
 " Lay-man, Compell'd by Necessity, should give Baptism to a Man that is ready to Perish, &c. I know
 " not whether any one can piously say, that it ought
 " to be repeated. If it be done without Necessity, it
 " is indeed an **Usurpation** of another Man's Office; but if he be **compell'd by Necessity**, it is
 " either no Fault at all, or but a very **Light One**."
 " Now in this Passage, thus set to rights, 'tis worthy our Observation.

First, That St. *Augustin* here speaks Dogmatically, giving his own private Opinion only, and not the Lawful Sense and Practice of the Church: He only puts a Case, that if a Lay-man should so baptize; he do's not relate any *Matter of Fact* of a Lay-man's having done so, and of its being agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Church, but, like a Casuist, supposes if such a thing should happen; and then he resolves upon it with a great deal of Hesitancy, as one not *sufficiently inform'd* what should be done in such a Case; "I know not [says he] "whether any one can piously say, that [such a Baptism] "ought to be repeated." I know not, is strange Language, about an *Undoubted Lawful Determination* of the Church: If she had determin'd the Unlawfulness of Repeating such a Baptism, sure St. *Augustin* would have **Known** of this; and if such a Determination had been *Pious*, then sure St. *Augustin* must have call'd it *Impious*, to have said, "That such a Baptism ought to be repeated:" But instead of any thing like this, for him to say [*Nescio an pie quisquam dixerit*] I know not whether any one can piously say so; plainly shews that he did not know, that it was

contrary to Piety to say, “*They ought to be repeated* ;” for he that does not know, **Whether** I can *piously* say a thing, do’s not know that ’tis impious for me to say it, because [the *Latin* word *An*] **Whether**, has always a Reference to two things, and when one of them only is nam’d in a Proposition, the contrary thereto is always to be understood ; as when a Man says, **I know not whether** you *are an honest Man*, he plainly means thereby, **I know not** whether you *are, or are not* an honest Man ; thereby shewing that he does not know what to determine on either side, tho’ still his Partiality to one side rather than the other, is evident enough ; and he shews that he questions the Honesty of the Man, tho’ he is not able to *prove him dishonest*. So here, St. *Augustin’s*, “**I know not whether** *any one can piously say*, that the [supposed] Baptism ought *to be repeated* ;” must mean, that he did *not know*, whether, on the one Hand, ’twas *Pious*, or on the other Hand, *contrary to Piety* to say so : His Partiality, ’tis true, is plain enough, that he questions the Piety of saying that such a Baptism ought to be repeated ; but then he plainly shews [by his *I know not whether, &c.*] that he was not able to prove it a Contradiction to Piety, to say that it ought to be repeated : From whence ’tis evident that St. *Augustine* did *not know*, that it was at that Time the *Pious* Lawful Sense and Practice of the Church, to call such pretended Baptisms, the *One Christian Baptism*, which ought not to be Repeated ; for if he had known so, instead of saying, *I know not whether* any One can *piously* say they ought to be repeated, he might have confidently affirm’d, “*I know that ’tis not Pious* to say so.” But we see, that this Fa-
ther

ther did not venture to be thus Positive, but Hesitates, and speaks of it in doubtful Terms, which he does not use to do when he speaks of the *General Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church*; for then he is Clear, Express, and Positive enough; thus for Example, The then **Catholick Practice*, of allowing the Validity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms in the Name of the Trinity, perform'd in Separation from the Church, is Plainly, and Fully, and Positively affirm'd by him, to have been *Search'd and Inquir'd into, Consider'd, Perfected, Confirm'd and Establish'd, with the Consent and Agreement of the whole [Christian] World*. But nothing like this, has he, or could he have said in all his Works in behalf of *usurped Lay-Baptisms*; and therefore we may conclude, that he knew of *No Pious, Lawful Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church*, in favour of the Validity of such pretended Baptisms, which is further Confirm'd by the other Observation upon this Passage of his, *viz.*

Secondly, That he plainly shews, he cannot clear such Usurpations from the Guilt of Sin: He says, of a Lay-man's being supposedly *Compell'd by Necessity*, to baptize, "*that it is either no Fault at all, or but a very light one.*" Now if it had been agreeable to the then *General Pious Sense and Practice* of the Church, 'tis reasonable to believe that he would have known it to be so; and then

* De iis verò qui ab Ecclesiæ unitate separati sunt, nulla jam quæstio est, quin & habeant & dare possint, & quin perniciose habeant, pernicioseque tradant extra vinculum pacis. Hoc enim jam in ipsa totius orbis unitate discussum, consideratum, perfectum atque firmatum est. *S. August. Contra Epist. Parmen. lib. 2. C. xiii. Sect. 30. Tom. 9. p. 45. Paris 1694.*

without any Hesitancy, he might have said, it is not only *no Fault at all*, but a *commendable Pious Action*, arising from a well inform'd Judgment, and due Sense of Duty; but *St. Augustin*, as knowing of no such *General Sense and Practice of the Church*, tells us, that *either 'tis no Fault at all*, or else but a *Light One*. Who can believe that this Saint would have allow'd the *Pious General Sense and Practice of the Church*, to be any Sin at all, of how small a sort soever? No, this is not the Language of an Evidence of the Church's *General Pious Sense and Practice*; and is therefore no more than his own private Opinion, which has nothing to do with our present Enquiry.

Mr. Bingham, in his 43d Page, produces another Passage from *St. Augustin*, in favour of Lay-Baptisms, even in ordinary Cases, thus; *St. Augustin's Words are these*, “ * *Though it be usurped without Necessity, and given by any Man to another, that which is given cannot be said not to be given, tho' it may be truly said to be unlawfully given. Therefore the Unlawful Usurpation is to be corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance. And if it be not Corrected, that which is given will remain to the Punishment of the Usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully, as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully: But yet it cannot be accounted as not given. No devout Soldier ever violates the Royal Stamp, tho' it be usurp'd by private Men: For tho' some by Stealth, and in a Clandestine way, set the Royal Stamp, not to the publick Money, but their own; yet the Money so stamp'd, when they are either*

* *August. Contra Epist. Parmen. Lib. 2. C. xiii.*

“punish’d, or pardon’d for their Offence, having the
 “*Royal Standard upon it, is not defac’d, but brought*
 “*into the King’s Treasury.*” “Whence (says
 “*Mr. Bingham, pag. 44.) ’tis plain, He [St. Au-*
 “*gustin]* “thought, that Baptism given by Lay-
 “*men in Ordinary Cases, which was an Usurpa-*
 “*tion of the Priest’s Office, was not to be repeated.*
 “And this he asserts in another Place against the
 “*Donatists; Yet not as the Determination*
 “*of any General Council, but as his own*
 “*Opinion:*” “For “he says, *If he were a Mem-*
 “*ber of such a Synod wherein this Question was de-*
 “*bated, he should not scruple to assert all those to*
 “*have Baptism, * wheresoever or by whomsoever*
 “*Baptiz’d, that had receiv’d it in Faith, and without*
 “*Dissimulation, in that Form of Words which is pre-*
 “*scrib’d by the Gospel; tho’ if they wanted Charity,*
 “*and were out of the Catholick Church, it would not*
 “*profit them to Salvation, or any other Spiritual*
 “*Concerns.*”

Thus we see how far *St. Augustin* was carry’d in the
 Heat of Dispute against the *Donatists*; for, because
 they Re-baptiz’d even the *Catholicks*, who had been
 before validly Baptiz’d In the Name of the Trinity,
 by Catholick Priests, [and this they did, upon
 pretence of their former Baptisms being a Pollution,
 as being defil’d by the Ministration of those, whom
 they call’d Wicked and Profane, and for that rea-
 son not Ministers of Jesus Christ] — There-
 fore *St. Augustin*, in his Dispute against this Pra-
 ctice of the *Donatists*, ran into the other Extreme,
 and asserted (as we see in these Passages) That
 Baptism perform’d “by any Man whomsoever,

* *August. de Baptismo, lib. vii. chap. 53.*

“or *wheresoever*,” if done with the Form of Words, In the Name of the Trinity, was good and valid, and not to be repeated : A Latitude so extremely singular, that it allows of Baptism, not only by Christian Lay-men, but even by Apostates, Jews, Turks, Pagans, and all other sorts of Infidels, not only in Cases of Extremity, when Priests are not to be had ; but also in Ordinary Cases, where *they are* or may be present. Such a Liberty is this, that nothing Sacred, no Divine Institution whatsoever can be of any Force upon Mens Consciences, if it should be *universally allow'd of* : And so unwarrantable is the Notion, that Mr. Bingham (as I have before observ'd, *pag. 105.*) acknowledges, That Baptism by Jews and Pagans, “*is one of the Novelties of Popery,*” *wholly New,* “and utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church.” Nay, even in this Place our Reverend Historian confesses, That this of *such Usurped Baptism*, was asserted by St. Augustin, “*Not as the Determination of any General Council,*” “*But as his own Opinion.*” So that it was nothing but St. Augustin's private Opinion, not the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* ; which is the Great Thing we are enquiring after, and which hitherto we cannot discover, by all that Mr. Bingham's *Scholastical History* has yet related.

As for St. Augustin, his Reasons for pretended Baptisms, (tho' usurp'd and perform'd by *any Man*, without Necessity) are none at all ; for he says, “*That which is given, cannot be said not to be given, tho' it may be truly said to be unlawfully given.*” This is plainly a begging of the Question ; for 'tis the thing deny'd : We say, in such Case, Christian Baptism *is not given* at all, and therefore not so much as *unlawfully given* ; let those who

who are Friends to St. *Augustin's* odd Opinion in this Matter, prove, (what he has not prov'd) That Christian Baptism is really, tho' *unlawfully given*, and we will have done. When Laws are Enacted for making *Conveyances* of Estates, or Privileges to Men; if those Laws require that the Conveyance should be made by the *Sign Manual, and Seal and Delivery*, of the *Principal Owner*, or his *Lawful Attorney*; 'tis false, to say, That the Conveyance is *really and validly* made by a *Cheating Usurper* who is not so *authorized*; no Law will allow this to be a *Valid Conveyance*, no, tho' it was done with all the *other necessary Requisites* of the Law; 'tis an absolute Nullity, and is very parallel to the Case before us. St. *Augustin* brands such pretended Baptisms with the odious Name of **unlawful Usurpations**; and so they justly deserve to be term'd, for they are Usurpations against all the Laws of God, and his Church; and if so, then there is **no Law** whereby to determine them Valid; and they cannot have a Legal Validity, without some Law or other whereby to try their Validity.

He says, "*The unlawful Usurpation is to be corrected, by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.*" This is undoubtedly necessary. But wherein do's this Repentance consist? Repentance must be differently express'd; and its Fruits must be *according to the Nature* of the Sin committed. Confession, Sorrow, Prayer for Pardon, Resolution to do so no more, and Constancy in keeping this Resolution, are not sufficient to constitute "*a sincere and affectionate Repentance*" for some sort of Sins: The Proper and Genuine Work of True Repentance, is, to *undo* (as much as lies in our Power) the Wickedness we have committed. Hence Restitution is necessary, in Cases of *Injustice, Robbery,*

Robbery, and Defamation ; and such Usurpations as are made by Persons, who, by all the Laws of God and his Church, are utterly excluded from *sacred Ministrations*, cannot properly be said to be *truly repented of*, without *undoing and making void*, in Fact, as much as we can, the thing which was *endeavoured to be usurped*. Thus, if a Presbyter should wickedly presume *to attempt to Ordain Men* to minister in Holy Things, his Repentance would be but false and spurious, if he did not, to the utmost of his Power, cause those *false Ordinations* to be undone, either by discovering the Persons he had so *pretendedly Ordain'd*, that they might be known not to be in Holy Orders ; or else, by endeavouring to cause them to be *validly Ordain'd* by the Bishop, if they are *duly qualified* for Holy Orders. And in this Case, it would not be just, to say *they receiv'd Holy Orders* before, *tho' unlawfully* ; for in truth, *they receiv'd them not at all* : This I desire our Episcopal Friends to consider. And as for those who are not entirely Episcopal, but think the Presbyterian Scheme to be as good as that of Episcopacy, [tho' they will never be able to prove it, to be any other, than a very wicked and sacrilegious Usurpation] I ask them, Whether if a Man, whom they esteem to be but a *meer Layman*, should presume to attempt to give Holy Orders ; I say, Would such a Man's Repentance for this Sin be sufficient, without discovering (to his power) the Persons he so pretendedly Ordain'd, and endeavouring, either to have them known as Persons *not Ordain'd*, or else to procure them to receive what the Presbyterians call *Valid Orders* ? Sure, our Friends to the Presbyterian Scheme will not call this *true Repentance* : And if not, then there is no reason to say, That the wicked Usurpations

tions of Persons pretending to Baptize, who never were Commission'd, are duly repented of, without their endeavouring to procure Baptism by a *Valid Commission*, to be given to those whom they, in their wicked Usurpations, did but *pretendedly baptize* before; for the same reason that holds for one, will hold for this other also.

St. *Augustin* says farther, concerning such a Usurpation, "If it be not corrected [*i. e.* by Repentance,] "that which is given will remain to the "Punishment of the Usurper, as well of him who "gave it unlawfully, as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully; but yet it cannot be accounted as not "given." Still begging the Question, that Baptism is given in these Cases: And it may as justly be said, that Holy Orders are given in the other Case I put above. The *Usurper's* Repentance I have already spoken of; and if he does not truly repent of **and correct** his Usurpation, his usurped Act will remain to his *Punishment*, (says St. *Augustin*.)

I am now to see what must be the Repentance of the *supposed Receiver*; and that is already discovered, by the Repentance of the *pretended Giver*: For as this latter, in the Case of a False Ordination, was bound to endeavour the Discovery of the *Falsly-Ordain'd* Persons, that they might be known as not Ordain'd, and so receive *Valid Ordination*; So, the Receiver of those False Orders, must repent of, and correct what was *pretendedly received* by him; he must not *claim* the *Privileges and Prerogatives* due to *Valid Holy Orders*; and if he would enjoy them, he must disclaim all pretended Right to them as due *by virtue of the Counterfeit Ordination*, and must receive Valid Orders from such as have Power to give them. Even so
the

the Receivers of these *pretended Baptisms*, if they *must repent* of their Part in the Usurpation, must necessarily acknowledge, that they have acquir'd *no Right* to the Privileges of a *Valid Baptism*, by virtue of the *Usurped Act*: The Usurped Act was Unlawful, with respect to *all the Laws* of God and his Church; therefore his Repentance must be such, as to express his *actual Obedience to those Laws*: He do's not shew *such Obedience to*, but even actual Rebellion against those Laws, while *he claims* (by virtue of a Usurper's Act, in Opposition to all those Laws) the same Privileges as are Conferr'd by others whom those Laws do *Authorize* to Conferr them; this is making the *Usurpation* to be only a *Circumstantial Fault*, when in truth 'tis also an *Essential one*, by reason of its *Contrariety* to the Essential Law of the Institution; as I humbly hope I have prov'd * in another Place; and therefore, Repentance for it, as a Fault against a *Circumstantial Law only*, when 'tis in truth, a Rebellion against *all Law whatsoever*, as well *Essential* as *Circumstantial*, is a continuing the Usurpation in a very great degree; and the Demanding of Privileges by *virtue thereof*, is in some sort an Equalizing its *pretended Legality*, with the Lawfulness of the *Commission'd Acts*, and so a False and Counterfeit Repentance. The Penitent then, must wave his *pretended Right* to the Privileges of a Commission'd Baptism; and seek for them, by endeavouring to procure Baptism from those who are *Commission'd* to give it him; and this his *Endeavour*, shews his sincere Repentance for *his part in the Usurpation*; and then, what was pretendedly given to him before, being now forsaken by him,

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

will not “remain to his Punishment,” as *St. Augustin* says it will, if the Usurpation “be not corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.”

As for *St. Augustin's* Simile about unlawful Coining of Money, I have answer'd it long since in * another Book to which the Reader is referr'd : And I have insisted thus long on *St. Augustin's* Notions, which he advanc'd in Defence of *Lay-Usurpations* ; because (as I have proved) they were only his own private Opinions, and not the Sense of the *Ancient Catholick Church* : And because I find some † Men of Character among ourselves, have copy'd these Notions from him, without so much as producing any Argument to support them, whose Great Names are notwithstanding (in the Opinion of some Men) sufficient to recommend them to be receiv'd as good and wholesome Doctrines, I shall therefore, from the Learned *Du Pin*, conclude all that I have to say of the Great *St. Augustin*, by shewing the Reader, that He was not wholly free from introducing Novelty in Religion ; and that the *Latin Fathers* after him, copy'd his Principles, and follow'd him, as their great Leader and Guide, in Matters of Divinity. — *Du Pin's* Words are these : || “ He [*i. e.* *St. Augustin*] “ starts several Questions never “ thought of before, and resolves many of them by “ the meer strength of his Wit. He often left the “ Notions of his Predecessors, to follow a Path “ wholly New, whether in Expounding the “ Scripture, or in Opinions of Divinity. That

* Dissenters and other Unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void, &c.

† Appendix to the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, Anno 1712.

|| *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. V. pag. 206, 207. Lond.*

“ may be said of him as to Divinity, which Cicero
 “ said of himself as to Philosophy, That he was
 “ **Magnus Opinatus,**” — [A great Opini-
 niator.] — “ He framed (if we may so say)
 “ the Body of Divinity for all the Latin Fathers that
 “ came after him. They have not only taken out of
 “ his Books the Principles they make use of, but
 “ often they have only copied them.” So that it will
 be no wonder, to find some of the Latin Writers
 after him, asserting the same as he did, in behalf
 of Lay-Baptisms: But all that he has said, a-
 mounts to no Evidence, that Baptism by Persons
 never Commission’d, was Good and Valid, in the
General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church.
 And as for his own Opinions in this Matter, they
 stand upon such weak Foundations, (as has been
 already prov’d) that they are of no Importance
 to our present Enquiry.

§ XXIX. *Gelasius* Bishop of Rome, Anno 492.
 is Mr. Bingham’s next supposed Evidence: Our
 Reverend Historian tells us, pag. 36. That this
 Bishop, in his Epistle to the Bishops of *Lucania*,
Brutia, and *Sicily*, * “ *Restrains the Office of Bap-*
 “ *tizing in Ordinary Cases to Bishops and Presbyters*
 “ *only; excluding Deacons from it, except in Cases*
 “ *of Extreme Necessity, when the Superior Ministers*
 “ *were absent: In which Cases, it was often al-*
 “ *low’d to Lay-Christians to perform it.*” And
 the Inference that Mr. Bingham draws from hence,
 is this; “ So that Lay-men had as much Autho-
 “ rity to perform it in the Absence of Deacons,
 “ as Deacons had to do it in the Absence of
 “ the Presbyters and Bishop.”

* *Gelas. Epist. 9. ad Episcop. Lucan. cap. 9.*

But in Answer to this, 1st, Mr. Bingham has not prov'd, neither can he prove, That the Apostles ever *Authoriz'd Lay-men* to Baptize at all; and he cannot deny, but acknowledges that they did Authorize Deacons: So that, by Apostolick Institution, Deacons had Authority to Baptize in Absence of the *Superior Orders*; which Authority, in Absence of the Deacons, appears never to have been given by the Apostles to *Lay-men*. 2^{dly}, He has not prov'd, That the **Ancient Catholick Church** gave Authority to Lay-men to Baptize in absence of the Deacons; and 'tis notorious, that it was the Office of the Deacons to do this in absence of the Bishops and Presbyters. From which Considerations 'tis evident, that Mr. Bingham's Inference from *Gelasius* is a Mistake, when he says, That "*Lay-men had as much Authority to [Baptize] in the absence of Deacons, as Deacons had to do it in the absence of the Presbyters and Bishops*"; for Lay-men never were so Authoriz'd by the Apostles, or by the Ancient Catholick Church, as Deacons were. And now let us enquire into the Force of what *Gelasius* himself says about Laymens Baptizing.

We are seeking for the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*, 1st, In respect to Laymens Baptizing, by virtue of a suppos'd Authority given to them; and 2^{dly}, In relation to Baptism by Persons, who never were at all Commission'd for that Purpose.

As for the First, *Gelasius's* Words point out nothing whereby we can discover any such *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; he refers us to *no general Council*, no Catholick constant Tradition from the Apostles Days, whereon to found the *Authority of Lay-men*:—He says only of Baptizing

when extreme Necessity compels [by reason of the Absence of the Clergy] that [*“Laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur:”*] It is often [or sometimes] **“granted to Lay-men to perform it.”** This do's not determine **who** they were that **granted** this, nay more, it shews, that even then it was **not always** granted; and it is therefore impossible from hence to conclude, that it was the *ancient Catholick Church's Grant*; and if it was not hers, 'tis no matter whose it was else. It may be *Gelasius* himself, or some of his *late Predecessors*, Bishops of *Rome*, made this *Grant* to empower some of their *own Lay-men* for such Cases, as the *Spanish Bishops* in the Council of *Eliberis* had done before them; or else it may be, that *Gelasius* only points at what those *Spanish Bishops* had done: But whether it be one, or the other, or both of these, it amounts to nothing but the Practice of *some particular Bishops*, not of the *ancient Catholick Church*: Nay further, if this had been (as it certainly was not) the *ancient Church's general Sense and Practice*, yet this Passage of *Gelasius* would not have been an Evidence, that pretended Baptism, by Persons *never commission'd* to Baptize, was the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*. For,

Secondly, His saying, **“It is granted to Lay-Christians;”** plainly shews, that they had not the Authority and Power in themselves as Lay-Christians: For the Thing **granted** was not in their Power before 'twas **granted**; if it was, then it was **no Grant**, and it would have been a meer Jest to talk of **granting a Power** to Lay-Christians, if they had it in themselves without such a **Grant**: Lay-Christians, as such therefore, had no such Power, because *Gelasius* says it was *granted* to them. Consequently, *if they could have such a Power*

Power conferr'd on them, this would not prove any thing in Behalf of those, who evidently have it not, and indeed never had it; which is the Case of our Laicks, against whose pretended Baptisms we are now disputing. And therefore Gelasius is no Evidence for any Validity in such spurious Baptisms.

§ XXX. *Isidore, Bishop of Sevil in Spain, about one hundred Years after Gelasius, viz. Anno 595. is Mr. Bingham's next suppos'd Evidence, pag. 37. And our Reverend Historian gives us that Bishop's Words thus: * "It is unlawful either for private*
" Men, or the inferior Clergy, [Clericis sine Gradu]
(who were Lay-men,) " to Baptize; for the Office be-
" longs only to Priests. We read in the Gospel that
" it was given by Commission to no other but the Apo-
" stles; Jesus after his Resurrection, saying unto
" them, as my Father hath sent me, so send I
" you; And when he had said this he breathed on
" them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Who-
" soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto
" them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are
" retain'd. And in another Place, Go Teach all
" Nations, Baptizing them In the Name of the
" Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.
" Whence it is manifest, that the Ministry of Baptism
" was committed only to Priests; nor is it lawful for
" Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery without
" a Bishop or a Presbyter: Except in their Absence,
" the extreme Necessity of Sicknes compels them to
" do it. In which Case also Lay-Christians are often
" permitted to do it; lest any one should be called

* *Isidor. de Offic. Ecclesiast. Lib. 2. c. 24.*

“*out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation.*” This is Mr. Bingham’s last Evidence in this Matter. And now we will examine to what purpose ’tis in our present Dispute.

And first, *Isidore* founds the Power of Baptizing upon the Commission given to the Apostles: So far we are agreed. Secondly, He hence infers, That “*the Ministry of Baptism was committed only to Priests.*” Now if by Priests he means only *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, *Isidore* himself was mistaken; for that Ministry was given also by the Apostles to *Deacons*, as Mr. Bingham himself has very justly observ’d; see p. 3. of his *Scholastical History*. Consequently, by the Divine Law, ’twas Lawful for *Deacons* to Baptize. But, Thirdly, *Isidore* says, It is not “*Lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery* [*Mysterium—explere absque Episcopis vel Presbyteris*] or rather to perfect the Mystery, without the *Bishops* or *Presbyters*: Except, in their Absence, the extreme Necessity of Sicknesse compel them to do it. This was a Matter of Order only, as it is now in our Church, that *Deacons* should give way to *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, their Superiors, and not presume to take place of them, but only Baptize in their Absence: Therefore, when *Isidore* says, ’tis not Lawful for them to Baptize, &c. He cannot be suppos’d to reckon them but equal to Laicks; for ’tis plain, that the Apostles gave them Power to Baptize, which they did not give to Laicks. And therefore their Exercise of that Power, in an irregular Circumstance, when *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were present, or might be had, tho’ it was unlawful, yet it was not so with respect to the Essence of the Commission, as if they never had receiv’d any Commission at all; but ’twas only unlawful with respect to the Circumstance of Order: It being a stand-

a standing Law of the Church, that Deacons should act in Subordination to Bishops and Presbyters, and give way to them in Sacred Ministrations. *Fourthly*, His telling us of the Power of Baptizing in want of the Clergy [*Quod & Laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, &c.*] That “it is often [or sometimes] “permitted [allow’d or granted] to Lay-Christians to Baptize, lest any one should be call’d out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation;” is still confining the Power of Baptizing to a suppos’d Commission to be first receiv’d, and abundantly shews, that Lay-Christians have not that Power in themselves as Christians, but it must be acquir’d by an *explicit Permission or Grant*; so that, if such a Commission could be given to Lay-Christians, yet even then, this Passage would not favour the Washings perform’d by our Laicks, who never had any Commission at all. And further, here is no Evidence that Lay-men were in the general Sense and Practice of the Church empower’d to Baptize in Absence of the Clergy. *Isidore* appeals to no general Council, or uninterrupted ancient Catholick Tradition or Practice: And being a Spanish Bishop, ’tis just and reasonable to believe, that he only has an eye to the Practice of the Spanish Church, in Consequence of their Council of *Eliberis*, which was no general Council, and determin’d nothing relating to Washings by Persons who never were commission’d to Baptize.

As for some Mens particular Opinions about the Minister of Baptism, ’tis no wonder that [especially after *St. Augustin’s Days*] they ran such unaccountable Lengths, as at last to reckon, that ’twas no matter who perform’d it, so that ’twas done with Water and Invocation of the Holy Trinity; for they follow’d the Opinion of that Father, That Water,

M 4

and

and the Name of the Trinity, were *absolutely necessary* to the Salvation of all Men. St. *Augustin* did not allow, that even Infants could be sav'd without Water; and hence he was for having Water apply'd by any one, with the Use of the Form, in the Name of the Trinity, as we have seen before; and to such a Latitude did Men run at last, that they in express Terms affirm'd Baptism to be valid, tho' perform'd by a Pagan. Thus *Gratian* reckons *Isidore* *—to have affirm'd; which if true, shews how valuable his Authority is in the Case of Baptism perform'd by *supposedly authoriz'd Lay-Christians*. So the same *Gratian* quotes a † Pope of Rome asserting the Validity of Baptism by a Pagan; and in || another Place, that it is all one whether perform'd by a Christian or Pagan, so that it was done in the Name of the Trinity: Nay, if it was done only in the Name of Christ, by a Pagan, the Persons so baptiz'd ought not to receive any other Baptism. So extravagant have Men been in their Notions of the meer Imitation of an *opus operatum* in this matter. But Mr. *Bingham* confesses this to be a *Popish Novelty*, and so indeed he ought in reason to acknowledge, that Baptism by Persons *never commis-*

* *Isidor. Non iteratur Baptisma quod à Pagano Ministratur. Apud Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. cap. xxii. pag. 1983. Edit. Taur. 1620.*

† *Romanus Pontifex, non hominem judicat qui Baptizat: sed spiritum Dei subministrare gratiam Baptismi licet Paganus sit qui Baptizat. Ibid. cap. xxiii.*

|| *A quodam Judeo nescitis utrum Christiano an Pagano, multos in patria vestra baptizatos asseritis, & quid de iis sit agendum consulitis. Hi profectò si in Nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis, vel tantum in Christi Nomine, sicut in actibus Apostolorum legimus, baptizati sunt (unum quippè idemque est, ut sanctus exponit Ambrosius [Lib. i. de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 3.] constat eos non esse denuò baptizandos. Ibid. cap. xxiv.*

tion'd at all to Baptize, is as much a Novelty of corrupt Popery, since the ancient Catholick Church never determin'd any thing in favour of these, any more than she did in favour of Pagan Baptism; and a Pagan has as much Power and Authority to Baptize, as our Laicks who never were commission'd any more than he.

XXXI. Our Reverend Historian is so sensible, that what he has produc'd from the Antients is nothing to the Purpose of pretended Baptisms by Persons never commission'd; that he sums up his whole Evidence in a very remarkable Manner, in these Words, pag. 38. "Thus we have seen [says he] for six hundred Years, the general Sense and Practice of the antient Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the Commission given to the Apostles, whereby Bishops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualified first to give Baptism themselves, and then to grant a Commission to others to Baptize, and that either to Presbyters or Deacons, or to Presbyters alone in ordinary Cases, and in Cases extraordinary and of extreme Necessity to Deacons and Lay-men." Thus Mr. Bingham acknowledges, that all his Evidences conspire in this, that the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Church was, that Baptism, whether in ordinary or extraordinary Cases, was administred by the Bishop, or else by such as had [or at least were suppos'd to have had] an Episcopal Commission to Baptize; from whence it necessarily follows, that even this suppos'd general Sense and Practice of the Church, as stated by Mr. Bingham, does not give Countenance to the Validity of pretended Baptisms perform'd ordinarily as well as extraordinarily, by Persons who never had an Episcopal Commission, and who yet presume

presume to attempt to Baptize, in Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy : So far from this was the supposed General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, that even in Cases of *Extreme Necessity*, we see Baptism was suppos'd to be perform'd, by none but such as were reckon'd to be *Impower'd by the Bishop* : Infomuch, that our Laicks pretended Baptisms, tho' done in Extremity, where none of the Clergy can be had, can claim nothing of Benefit from the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church* for the first 600 Years of Christianity, by Mr. Bingham's own Account of the Matter, whereby he makes Baptism, even in Cases of *Extreme Necessity*, to be founded upon a *Commission given by Bishops to Deacons and Lay-men to Baptize*.

§ XXXII. But not to leave this Matter here ; I affirm, That all Mr. Bingham's Evidence summ'd up together, do's not amount to so much as a Proof, That the *Ancient Catholick Church's* Sense and Practice for the first 600 Years, was, to *Commission or Authorize Lay-men* to Baptize, in want of the Clergy.

For, The first 300 Years have not so much as One Evidence of any One Lay-man *so Authorized*.

Tertullian's Opinion was singular, That Lay-Christians, as such, had that Power in themselves : He did not suppose any such *Authority given to them* by the Bishops ; nay, he suppos'd them also to have Power to minister the other Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, in absence of the Clergy. But *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleagues, are plain Evidences against this his singular Notion of Lay-mens Power to Baptize, and the Founda-
tion

tion upon which he grounds their pretended Power, has been already overthrown.

The Council of *Eliberis*, which made a Canon to *Authorize* some particular sort of their own Laymen, who were in Communion with their Bishop, to Baptize a Catechumen in Danger of Death, when the Clergy could not do it; has been largely prov'd to be a Contradiction to *Tertullian's* Notion; and that it was but a Provincial Council of *Spanish* Bishops, not a General Council, and therefore not Declaratory of the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church; since, in the whole space of the first 600 Years, this Council stands singular by it self; no other Council whatsoever, whether General or Provincial, during that Period, made any such Canon.

The Story of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing his Play-fellows in Sport, and of *Alexander's* determining, that the Children should have no other Baptism; besides its being Fabulous, is no Instance of a Laicks Baptizing by the Bishop's Commission and Authority: If it had been true, it would not have been an Instance of the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church; being, upon that Supposition, but the Private Act of one single Bishop only: Nay farther, the supposing the whole Story to be true, and the Determination thereupon to be just and good, would naturally tend to the Exposing of all Divine Institutions, to be Ridicul'd and Despis'd, as insignificant and Childish things, and so make way for the Extirpation of all Reveal'd Religion out of the World.

St. *Jerom's* Saying, Of the Lawfulness of Laicks Baptizing in Case of Necessity, has been prov'd to be built on *Tertullian's* false Foundation; to be no Instance of the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient*

Ancient Catholick Church ; but to be an Inconsistency with himself, and a Contradiction to that Catholick Principle, whereby he confuted the *Luciferian* Schismatick, who reckon'd the *Arian* Clergy to be but Lay-men, and whose Baptism, St. *Jerom* affirm'd, ought therefore to be rejected, if the *Luciferians* Opinion were true.

St. *Augustin*'s Opinions have been examin'd ; he proves nothing, but supposes the Validity of an Imitated *Opus Operatum*, without any Argument ; he speaks things upon Hear-say only ; he hesitates, and cannot determine, as to *his Knowledge*, about Usurped Lay-Baptisms being Valid ; he gives us no Proof of any General Council, nor of any Tradition shewing the *General Sense and Practice* of the Ancient Catholick Church, for Laymens being Authoriz'd to Baptize. And,

Lastly, *Gelasius* and *Isidore*, tho' they say that Lay-men were often Authoriz'd to Baptize, in Case of Necessity, yet neither of them points at the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* ; No General Council, No Catholick Tradition, No Universal Practice of the Bishops of the Catholick Church ; they leave us in the dark, as to these ; and therefore 'tis just and reasonable to infer, that they speak only, either of their own or some other particular Mens Practices, and therefore are of No Authority to us in this Matter.

Upon the Whole, The profound Silence of the Days of the Apostles and Apostolick Fathers, and of the Three first Centuries of Christianity, concerning Lay-mens being at all Commission'd to Baptize, is a full Proof, that the Bishop's Authorizing of them to Baptize, can never be founded on any Catholick Tradition of the Primitive Church of Christ : And more, If there had in truth been such

such a **Catholick Tradition**, even from the Times of the Apostles to this Day, [as there never was,] yet still this would be of no Advantage to the pretended Baptisms of our Laicks, [*i. e.* our *Dissenters*,] who were never Commission'd by Bishops, [and indeed, who cannot be Commission'd, for they have **no Bishops**] to Baptize.

This is the Result of all Mr. *Bingham's* Evidences: But at the End of this Book, I shall sum up the whole Evidence *for* and *against* Baptism by Persons who *never were Commission'd*, or who were suppos'd to have *no Commission*, to Baptize; which it is not so proper to do here, before I have *Answer'd* Mr. *Bingham's* *Objections*, against several of the Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers against Unauthorized Baptisms, and also his *Objections* relating to the Antient *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms allow'd of by the Church, which Mr. *Bingham* endeavors to make look like our *Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*.

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

ANSWERS to Mr. Bingham's OBJECTIONS,
*against the Testimonies of St. Cyprian,
 St. Basil, and St. Chrysoftom, who reckon'd
 pretended Baptisms by Persons never Com-
 mission'd, to be Null and Void.*

OBJECT. **T**HE Evidence of those Three
 I. Fathers I have already shewn,
*Chap. III. § XII, XIII, XXIII,
 XXIV.* And our Reverend Historian, in his 38th
 Page, says, That if their Evidence were entirely on
 our Side, "*It would not weigh very much; because*
" it would be only their Private Sense, and not the
" Practice of the Church, which is the Subject of our
" present Enquiry."

ANSW. Now our Side, *i. e.* the Proposition we
 insist upon, is this, That pretended Baptisms, by
 Persons *never Commission'd to Baptize*, is Null and
 Void. These Three Fathers, (besides others which
 I have produc'd) are entirely with us in this Point,
 as I have already prov'd. Mr. Bingham has brought
no Evidence of any One Church upon Earth, for
 the first Six hundred Years of Christianity, de-
 termining the contrary; the Story of the Boy
Athanasius Baptizing his Play-fellows, and of the
 Church of *Alexandria's* allowing it to be Valid,
 having been prov'd to be but a meer Fiction: So
 that all Mr. Bingham's Evidence for this Side of the
 Question, is from no other than the *Private Opi-
 nion's* of *Tertullian* and *St. Jerom*, Two Presbyters;
 and

and *Optatus* and St. *Augustin*, Two Bishops; the Two first upon false Principles, and the other Two meerly upon their own private Opinion, without giving any good Reason for it: And one of them, St. *Augustin*, at the same time hesitating and doubting about it, as I think I have largely prov'd.

As for any other Evidence Mr. *Bingham* has brought, viz. from the Spanish Council of *Eliberis*, St. *Augustin*, *Gelasius* and *Isidore*, they wholly relate only to Baptism *suppos'd to have been authoriz'd by Bishops*; which is foreign to our present Enquiry, tho' even *they* are no Proofs of the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*, but only show how far some Bishops thought themselves to have been empower'd to *authorize others to Baptize*, namely, their own Lay-men in want of the Clergy. And whether they thought and practis'd rightly or no, this is certain, that their particular Practice has not been prov'd to be the *Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church*. And further; nothing in favour of pretended Baptisms, by Laicks *never authoriz'd* by their Bishops, and acting in opposition to them, can be at all inferr'd therefrom. And therefore the Testimonies of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysostom*, against the Validity of spurious Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were Episcopally Commission'd, and therefore have *no Priestly Power* to Baptize, are of very great Weight and Importance; 1st, Because their Evidence is founded on the Divine Positive Institution of Baptism; 2^{dly}, Because it is corroborated by other concurring Evidence; And 3^{dly}, Because it never was gainsay'd or oppos'd by any Law or Tradition of the ancient Catholick Church, nor so much as by any authentick Law or Tradition of but one Particular, Ancient, Orthodox Church of Christ.

But

But Mr. Bingham has particular Objections against the Evidence of those Fathers respectively, which I now come to Answer.

OBJECT. II. He says, “*When Chrysostom confines the Office of Baptism to the Hands of a Priest, he only means in ordinary Cases, otherwise Deacons, who are no Priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all Cases whatsoever, as well as Lay-men; and yet Chrysostom allows Deacons to Baptize in Cases of Necessity, which makes it evident, that his Discourse only relates to the Ministration of Baptism in ordinary Cases.*”

ANSW. All this is very fallacious; for Mr. Bingham cannot fairly deny, that Deacons are so far Priests as they are impower’d to Baptize: See what I have said, p. 16, & 17. Himself says, That Baptism perform’d by the Bishop’s Authority, was reputed as *his Act*: See his 8th Page. He therefore must acknowledge, that when Deacons Baptize by virtue of *that Commission* they receiv’d from the Bishop, ’tis Baptism by a *Priestly Power and Authority*, and done by the Hands of a Priest, a Deacon being so far a Priest; and moreover *his Act* being the Bishop’s Act, who is the High Priest. And therefore Mr. Bingham’s Objection is lost; for ’tis plain, that St. Chrysostom’s confining the Office of Baptism to the Hands of a Priest, relates both to *ordinary* and *extraordinary* Cases too, because, even for Cases of Extremity, he points out no other than the Hands of a Priest of the lowest Order, viz. a Deacon to Baptize; and therefore St. Chrysostom absolutely excludes all such, as can upon no account whatsoever be said to be vested with *Priestly Authority*, viz. all who never

never were authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize. The Reader may also see Mr. Bingham's whole Objection provided against in p. 114. and therefore this may suffice here in Answer thereto.——

O B J. III. His next Objection is against St. Basil's Evidence thus, in his 39, 40, and 41 Pages, "As to St. Basil—" *he had somewhat of a singular Opinion in this matter; for he was for re-baptizing all Persons that were only baptized by Lay-men.—But he was not so stiff—as to unchristian those that were baptiz'd by Schismatics, or break the Communion of the Church upon it: For he gives his Advice—That Men should quietly comply with the Rules and Practice of their own Church where they liv'd. But forasmuch (says he) as some of the Asiatick Churches think otherwise, that the Baptism of such, by way of Dispensation for the sake of great Multitudes, ought to be receiv'd, let it be receiv'd. "Whence I think (says Mr. Bingham) it may be inferr'd, that tho' St. Basil, in his own Opinion, did not approve of the Baptism either of Schismatics or Lay-men, yet he thought it might stand good, if the Church thought fit to receive and confirm it; and this he seems to assert upon the common Principle of the Antients, that a Latitude of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours of the Church to ratifie such Baptisms, when they found it necessary for the Benefit and Edification of the Church. But if otherwise, St. Basil's Opinion cannot Prejudice the contrary Doctrine, or be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church. And yet it may be observ'd, that St. Basil speaks perhaps, not of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of usurping the Office, as Hereticks did in ordinary*

N

" Cases:

“**Cases** : Which makes a wide Difference in the
 “ Case, and belongs to a more difficult Question,
 “ that is, Whether **unauthoriz’d Baptisms**, were
 “ ever **ratified** and made good by the subsequent
 “ **Confirmation** and Reception of the Church?

A n s w. The Reader, by considering what I have said already, Page 109, &c. upon St. Basil’s Evidence against Lay-Baptism, may observe, that St. Basil speaks of Lay-men as Persons *not having Authority* to baptize; that he makes their want of Power and Authority to be the Reason of the Invalidity of their Baptizing; that he reckon’d the Schismatics here spoken of, to have been by their Separation from the Church reduc’d to **Lay-men**, and that consequently they had **no Power** to minister in holy Things, and that *therefore* because they were as Lay-men, Persons without Commission, their Baptisms were *Null and Void*: And ’tis notorious against the first part of Mr. Bingham’s Objection, that he was *not Singular* in this Principle; for St. Cyprian and Firmilian are quoted by him, as having been of the same Principle; and I have also prov’d from St. Cyprian’s Works, that they and others of their Colleagues were really so; and consequently Mr. Bingham’s Charge of Singularity against St. Basil is very unfair, especially if it be also consider’d that his Epistle to *Amphilochius* Bishop of Iconium, out of which his Evidence is taken, is a *Canonical Epistle*, and reckon’d as Canon Law in the Code of the *Greek Church*. Thus much for Mr. Bingham’s Charge of Singularity against St. Basil.

Now for the Consequence Mr. Bingham draws from that Father’s acquiescing in the Practice of some *Asiatick Churches*, who receiv’d the Baptisms
 of

of Schismatics. — “ *Whence I think (says Mr. Bingham) “ it may be inferr’d, that tho’ St. Basil, “ in his own Opinion, did not approve of the Baptism, either of Schismatics or Lay-men, yet “ he thought it might stand good, if the Church “ thought fit to receive and confirm it.”* Here Mr. Bingham blends and confounds together **Schismatical** and **Lay-Baptism**, and infers, that St. Basil thought they might **both stand good**; when ’tis notorious by St. Basil’s First Canon of that Epistle, and the Connection of his Words, that he speaks of nothing else, that *may stand good*, but the **Schismatical Baptisms** receiv’d and allow’d of by the *Asiatick Churches*; and Mr. Bingham might have seen this, even in St. Basil’s Words as himself has translated them, which are these; “ *But forasmuch as some of the Asiatick Churches “ think otherwise, that the Baptism of such, [viz. of the Puritans, Encratites, Hydroparastats, and Apotactites, the Schismatics he was just before speaking of] “ by way of Dispensation for the “ sake of Great Multitudes, ought to be receiv’d; let it be receiv’d.*” I say, from these very Words, ’tis plain, that St. Basil speaks of none but the **Schismatical Baptisms**, the Baptisms receiv’d by “ **Great Multitudes**,” for we know that those Schismatics were *Numerous*, and that consequently so were their Baptisms, yet we know also that they had *Episcopal Orders*; and whether their Orders were *Null and Void*, by reason only of their *Schism*, is another Question. St. Basil thought they were, and consequently that they were as *Lay-men*. Some *Asiatics* did not *Null their Orders*; St. Basil therefore, for the sake of **Multitudes** concern’d in this, and because of the Practice of those *Asiatick Churches* which did

not Null the Orders of those Schismatics, said,
 “*Let their Baptism be receiv’d.*” This does not
 signify, that he meant, Let Lay-Baptisms, Bap-
 tisms by *Persons never Commission’d*, be receiv’d:
 He only abated of his Rigour of Condemning the
 Schismatics to be but meer Laicks; he would
 have lik’d it, if they had by those Churches been
 reduc’d to *that State*, as they were by the *Cypria-
 nick Churches*; but since those *Asiatick Churches*
 did not so far condemn them, he acquiesc’d in
 the Discipline of those Churches, and reckon’d
 that their * *Orders and Baptisms* might be receiv’d:
 But ’twas never heard of, that in those Churches,
Lay-men, really and *incontestably* such, assum’d to
 themselves any Power at all to baptize, without,
 or in opposition to their Bishop’s Commission; and
 therefore the **Great Multitudes** here spoken of
 by *St. Basil*, must signify only the great Multi-
 tudes of Persons that were concern’d, in the Epis-
 copal Orders and Baptisms given and receiv’d, by
 the Schismatics before spoken of by that Father.
 This, together with what I have before said in
Page 109, &c. I think to be a sufficient Answer to
 this part of *Mr. Bingham’s* Objection against *St. Ba-
 sil’s* Evidence.

There is another remarkable Thing in *Mr. Bing-
 ham’s* Objection, which must not be pass’d over,
 and ’tis this, That he doubts of his own Infer-
 ence, which he makes from *St. Basil’s* Words; for
 first he introduces it with an “*I think it may*
 “*be inferr’d, that tho’ St. Basil——did not ap-
 “prove of the Baptism of Lay-men, yet he thought*
 “*it might stand good, &c.*” This shews that he

* *Clergy-man’s Vade mecum*, Part II. p. 201.

cannot be Positive in his Inference; for if he could, his "*I think it may be, &c.*" is a needless Modesty; and not only so, but prejudicial to his Reader, as it leaves him undetermin'd in this Matter: But I doubt not, Mr. Bingham easily foresaw, that it would be objected against his *may be Inference* about Lay-Baptism, that St. Basil was only speaking of the *Asiatics* admitting of *Schismatical Baptisms*, and that St. Basil do's not say, that Lay-Baptisms might stand good; and Mr. Bingham having blended and confounded Lay-Baptisms with Schismatical Baptisms, concludes his Inference with a mis-giving Air of Suspicion, that it would not do: He hesitates about it, and says, "But if otherwise, [*i. e.* if St. Basil did not think that Lay-Baptisms, as well as Schismatical Baptisms, might stand good]" St. Basil's Opinion (says Mr. Bingham) "*cannot prejudice the contrary Doctrine, or be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church.*" Thus we see that himself cannot assure us of the Truth of his own Inference about Saint Basil's supposed Thoughts of allowing Lay-Baptism; and therefore we may conclude, that St. Basil do's not appear to have thought, that Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* Baptism by Persons *having no Power*, being never authoriz'd to Baptize, could stand good and valid; but the contrary: And Mr. Bingham's saying, that St. Basil's Opinion, "*cannot be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church;*" is taking for granted what he has not prov'd, that the *common Consent and Practice* of the Ancient Church, was, to allow as valid, pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons never Commision'd to Baptize.

Mr. Bingham says further, that "*it may be Ob-*
serv'd that St. Basil speaks perhaps, not of Lay-
Baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of Usurping the
Office, as Hereticks did in ordinary Cases." But
 these **Perhaps's** will not serve our Turn, they
 are *No Arguments*; nay, they are Fallacious upon
 the Judgments of some sort of Readers, who are
 too apt to be carried away with such *ungrounded*
Suppositions: What has St. Basil said in all his Wri-
 tings, that can give the least Colour for such a
Perhaps? There is nothing in all his Works,
 that looks towards *Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necess-*
sity; and when he speaks of Lay-Baptisms, he
 do's it in such Terms, as include all Cases what-
 soever, and *No Exception* made for *Extraordinary*
Cases, nor Limitation to *Ordinary Ones*. At this
 rate, a Man may Limit and Restrain the most
Universal Propositions; thus, for Example, "*Go*
ye Disciple all Nations, Baptizing them In the
Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the
Holy-Ghost." By Mr. Bingham's way of **Per-**
hapsing, may not be design'd to restrain the
Form of Baptizing "*In the Name of the Trini-*
ty," to That *Form* alone, for all Cases whatso-
 ever; there may be suppos'd *Cases of Necess-*
sity! when Men cannot procure Baptism in
this Form; their Baptizers, tho' Episcopally Or-
 dain'd, may have **false Notions concerning**
the Deity; and in Consequence thereof, may
Mutilate and Change the Form, and refuse to give
 Baptism in the prescrib'd Form: Some reckon,
 however, that *Water is absolutely Necessary* to Sal-
 vation, therefore, in their Imagination, this would
 be a *Case of Necessity*, and so the *New*, tho' *Unin-*
stituted Form, will do, because, Water must be ap-
 ply'd; and therefore, the Instituted Form **Per-**
haps

haps was not appointed for *Cases of Necessity!* especially considering that *Even a Pope of Rome* has said, that Baptism is good and valid, if done *In the Name of Jesus only!* But who is there, that do's not see the Folly of this way of **Perhaps-
ing?**

As for Mr. Bingham's Supposition, "*That a Latitude of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours of the Church to Ratify such Baptisms* [*i. e.* Baptisms by Lay-men, Persons destitute of Power, never authoriz'd to Baptize] "*when they found it necessary, &c.*" 'Tis a Proposition that *has not been proved;* and I have said so much upon it * elsewhere, that I see no Necessity to trouble my Reader with any thing more upon it, till Mr. Bingham, or Somebody else, shall offer their **Arguments** for such a Ratifying Power; and therefore I proceed to our Reverend Historian's next Objection, which is this.

OBJECT. IV. Against St. Cyprian's Evidence, he objects thus in his 39th Page, "*If it were not for St. Basil's Testimony (says he) I should doubt whether Cyprian had ever made use of such an Argument as this,*" [*viz.* That Hereticks and Schismatics, broken off from the Church, were become Lay-men, and that therefore the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics were Null and Void, because they were become Lay-men.]

ANSW. But here, either Mr. Bingham believes St. Basil's Testimony concerning St. Cyprian, or Mr. Bingham do's not believe it. If he believes it,

* Lay-Baptism Invalid.

then there's an end of his Doubt about St. Cyprian's Argument——and so his following imaginary Reasons against St. Cyprian's ever having us'd such an Argument fall at once. But if he do's not believe St. Basil, then he might have plainly told us so, and not have amus'd us with an "*If it were not for St. Basil's Testimony.*" This looks, however, as if he could not charge St. Basil with being a false Evidence; tho' still he endeavours to take off from the Worth of his Testimony, by his following Three Observations.

First, "*Because (says Mr. Bingham) no such Argument [about Lay-men] that I know of is to be found in his [i. e. St. Cyprian's] Works.*"

But if Mr. Bingham do's not know of any such Argument in St. Cyprian's Works, others do know of it; and 'tis plain enough there to be found, that St. Cyprian and his Colleagues, reduc'd Hereticks and Schismatics, though ordain'd before in the Church, to the State of Lay-men; that they receiv'd them only to Lay-Communion upon their Repentance; that they reckon'd them *Not as Priests*, but Destitute of **Priestly Power and Authority**, and that they charg'd their Ministrations to be Null and Void, for want of such Priestly Power, as I have prov'd before, Page 51, &c.

Secondly, His next Observation against St. Cyprian's having ever made use of such an Argument is, "*Because Tertullian, whom Cyprian commonly call'd his Master, made a great Distinction between the Baptism of Hereticks and the Baptism of Catholick Lay-men, at least in Cases of Necessity——*" for he was against Re-baptizing, those that were so Baptized by Lay-men, tho' he was as much "*for*"

“for Re-baptizing those that were Baptiz’d* by Hereticks, as Cyprian himself.

Here I must not let pass a remarkable Fallacy, and ’tis this; Mr. Bingham says, *Tertullian* “was against Re-baptizing those that were so Baptiz’d by Lay-men.” An uncautious Reader will be apt to believe from hence, that *Tertullian* has related it to be *Matter of Fact*, that Persons were Baptiz’d by Lay-men in his Days; when ’tis certain that he relates *No such Matter of Fact*, but is only speaking of Lay-men, as if they might Baptize, not as if they had Baptiz’d in Cases of the Clergy’s Absence.——His Words are plain enough, as Mr. Bingham has ’em in his 26th Page, [† “*Etiam Laicis jus est;*”] Lay-men (says *Tertullian*) have also a **Right** to give it [*i. e.* Baptism.] This shews that ’twas *Tertullian*’s Opinion, that they had a *Right*; but it do’s not prove it *Matter of Fact*, that any of them Acted according to this *Pretended Right*. Mr. Bingham therefore should have said, that *Tertullian* would have been “against Re-baptizing Persons, if they had been so Baptiz’d by Lay men,” which would have prevented his Reader from mistaking a pretended *Matter of Fact* instead of a suppos’d *Matter of Right*: This being clear’d, there is no doubt but *Tertullian* would have been against what Mr. Bingham calls Re-baptizing such Persons.——But what then, do’s it therefore follow, that St. Cyprian was of *Tertullian*’s Principle in this Matter, because he call’d *Tertullian* his Master? This is admirable! I esteem, and may call *Cicero* my Master, therefore

* *Tertul. De Baptismo, Cap. 15.*

† *Tertul. De Baptismo, Cap. 17.*

I must be a Heathen because *Cicero* was so; I and a great many other Members of our Church have been mightily pleas'd with Mr. *Bingham's* Antiquities of the Christian Church; therefore whatsoever Mr. *Bingham* says and believes, I and they must believe it too, whether it be right or wrong! But our Reverend Historian will find himself very much mistaken if he thinks so; for we may *Highly Value* a Man, and even call him *Our Master* too, for *some of his Excellencies*, when at the same time we may see his Faults, and Mistakes, &c. and dissent from, nay, and abhor them too; tho' it may be we do not always *make publick Proclamation* of them. And this, no doubt, was the Case with the blessed *St. Cyprian*; he valued *Tertullian* for his great Accomplishments of *Wit*, &c. he call'd him his Master, but 'tis no ways reasonable to suppose, that he *therefore* believed his many Errors. Is it rational to believe, that he follow'd him in *Montanism*, and in those Errors I have mention'd in *Page 46.* of which I have there given a particular Catalogue in the Margin, for a Memorandum to the Learned Reader? No, certainly that Pious Father was not so blind, as to be led into his *supposed Master's* Errors and Mistakes, and particularly in the Matter now before us, which I humbly hope I have proved to have been One of *Tertullian's* Singularities; and in *Page 48.* that *St. Cyprian* did not follow him in it, but asserted the contrary Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* pretended Baptism perform'd by Persons destitute of a Commission to Baptize.

Thirdly, Mr. *Bingham's* last Observation against *Saint Cyprian's* ever having made use of such an

an Argument, as that of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is this, viz. "Cyprian *always paid a far greater Deference to Catholick Lay-men than he did to Heretical Priests; as esteeming the One Members of the Church, and the Other quite cut off from it: He admitted the One into his Councils, and did nothing without their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Causes; but the Other he abandon'd and abhor'd, as Men that had abandon'd the Faith, and renounc'd their Christianity by their Heretical Doctrine.*" And what is to be infer'd from all this? Did St. Cyprian therefore approve of Baptism by Catholick Lay-men, this is meer Amusement; as if, because St. Cyprian lov'd and valu'd Catholick Lay-men, and voluntarily took their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Cases; therefore he would not have been offended, he would not have esteem'd their Attempts Null and Void, if they had endeavour'd to do any thing in the *Sacerdotal Ministration* of Holy Sacraments! This is just as good Sense, as if I should say, that Mr. Bingham loves and esteems a pious, judicious, and orthodox Lay-man of the Church of England, better than he do's a Schismatical or Heretical Priest, who separates, or is excluded, from her Communion; and that he would follow the Advice of the *Former* in Church Matters, and not admit of the other so much as into his Company, much less to be his Adviser and Counsellor in Ecclesiastical Affairs; and from thence conclude, that if the Church-Lay-man should, thro' a *false Zeal*, &c. attempt to ordain Men into the Ministry, Mr. Bingham's Love and Esteem for him, would oblige him to acknowledge the Validity of such a *supposed Ordination*, tho' at the same time he would not have allow'd the like of the Heretical

cal or Schismatical Priest had attempted to Ordain. Who is there that do's not see the Weakness of such a Supposition? And upon what Foundation can Mr. *Bingham* guess that St. *Cyprian* was of so Partial a Temper, as to esteem pretended Baptism by Church-Lay-men, Persons having no Authority to Baptize, to be good and Valid, when 'twas at the same time his Principle, that Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were Null and Void, because perform'd by Persons who were suppos'd to be destitute of Priestly Power and Authority to minister in Holy Things?——But enough upon Mr. *Bingham's* Observations about this Matter; for himself, do's but say of 'em, “*These are probable Arguments to incline a Man to think, that Cyprian was of the same Mind with his Master Tertullian, as to the Point of Lay-Baptism, had not St. Basil's Authority been against them, Page 40.*”——We have seen, that St. *Basil's* Testimony is good: That there is not so much as any Probability in Mr. *Bingham's* supposed Arguments: And that St. *Cyprian* did not follow his Master's Errors, particularly in the Pretended Priesthood of Lay-men, but taught the contrary Doctrine, as is plain by the Testimony of St. *Basil*, and by Inferences that may be, and have been drawn from several Passages in St. *Cyprian's* own Works. And thus all our Reverend Historian's Objections against the Evidence of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysostom*, are of no Weight or Importance.

C H A P. V.

Mr. Bingham's Acknowledgments concerning the great Question now in Dispute, viz. Whether the Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Lay-men, was allowed to be Valid?

§ I. **O**UR Reverend Historian handles this Question in his 41st Page; and here one would naturally have expected to have found abundance of uncontested Evidence and Testimony from the Ancient Catholick Church, that such pretended Baptisms were, by Her, held to be Good and Valid; if it had ever been, the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*, to esteem them as such. But instead of producing any Evidence for their Pretended Validity; (and consequently for the Validity of our Dissenters supposititious Baptisms, which are evidently *Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptisms by Lay-men*) Mr. Bingham very fairly and ingenuously confesses, that this of "*Unauthoriz'd Usurped Lay-Baptism makes a wide Difference in the Case, Page 41. and is a more Difficult Question,*" [*viz. than that of Lay-Baptism [suppos'd to be] Authoriz'd by Bishops, in Cases of Extremity, about which he had been Treating before.*] He says this Question of "*Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Lay-men has much more difficulty than the Former.*" And he gives this particular Reason why 'tis so "*much more Difficult, because (says he) a great many*" of

“ of the Authors who have justified the Lawfulness of
 “ Lay Baptism, in Cases of Necessity, are wholly
 “ silent upon this Point.” “ For [continues he]
 “ neither Tertullian, nor the Council of Eliberis,
 “ nor St. Jerom, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, have
 “ said any thing upon it; they **Only** consider the
 “ Case of Necessity, and no other.”

§ II. And to this I must add some other Reasons, why this of Usurped Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptism is so very Difficult a Question; and they are these from Mr. Bingham himself.

First, Because “ The Apostolick Commission to Baptize, was to continue to the end of the World,” according to Mr. Bingham, in his 3d Page.

Secondly, Because the Conveyance of this Commission to others, “ was necessary to preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, in future Ages,” as in his 3d Page.

Thirdly, Because “ No One can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives, some way or other, a Commission from the Apostles.” See his 4th Page.

Fourthly, Because “ The Original Power of Administring Baptism is lodg'd solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops, as the Apostles immediate Successors, and derivately Convey'd from them to others,” in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary also, as in his 5th Page.

Fifthly, Because “ When Baptism was done by others, [i. e. not by the Bishop] the Antients thought “ it was still done by his Authority, and reputed as his Act.” See his 8th Page.

Sixthly, and Lastly, Because Mr. Bingham, in summing up his whole Evidence, in his 38th Page, says, “ Thus we have seen for Six hundred Years,
 “ the

“ the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient
 “ Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the
 “ Commission given to the Apostles; whereby Bi-
 “ shops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualified first
 “ to give Baptism themselves, and then to Grant a
 “ Commission to others to Baptize; ——— in Or-
 “ dinary Cases, and in Cases Extraordinary and of
 “ Extream Necessity, &c.

These are Reasons which make the present Que-
 stion of Unauthoriz'd Usurp'd Lay-Baptisms so
 very Difficult, that there is “ a wide Differ-
 “ ence ” between these pretended Baptisms, and
 the others, suppos'd to have been minister'd by
 Episcopal Authority; so that we see even from
 Mr. Bingham's own Account of the Matter, that the
 general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church
 has nothing in favour of Usurp'd Unauthoriz'd Lay-
 Baptisms.

§ III. It is therefore evident, that the gene-
 ral Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, can-
 not be call'd in as an Evidence, for the pretended
 Validity of such false Baptisms; No! No! they
 stand by themselves, utterly Destitute of that Ca-
 tholick Testimony, and have Nothing to support
 them but the weak, fallacious, and imaginary Rea-
 sonings of a private Spirit only.

For, First, The Apostolick Commission to Bap-
 tize, is here discontinued and broken off.

Secondly, The Conveyance of that Commission
 is here wanting, and so, that which is “ Necessa-
 “ ry to Preserve the Church, according to the Or-
 “ der of Christ ——— is absent.

Thirdly, Here is a Destitution of Power to Bap-
 tize, because here is No One that has receiv'd any
 manner

manner of way whatsoever, *A Commission from the Apostles.* Because,

Fourthly, The Original Power of administering Baptism, "Lodg'd solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops—the Apostles immediate Successors, is not here Derivately Convey'd from them to the Usurping Unauthoriz'd Lay-Pretender.

Fifthly, Here being No Baptism done by the Bishop's Authority, the pretended Baptism cannot be reputed as the Bishop's Act.

Sixthly, and Lastly, In this Act there is nothing to be seen of the general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, for the first Six hundred Years, which was confessedly "grounded upon the Commission granted in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary too;" for here is No Grant of any Commission at all—and so, these pretended Baptisms are destitute of any Law, Rule, or Ancient Catholick Tradition, whereon to ground their pretended Validity.

§ IV. And yet notwithstanding all this, our Reverend Historian, in his 43d, 44th, and 45th Pages, Instances the Fiction of the suppos'd Sportive-Baptism, said to have been given by the Boy *Athanasius*, to his Play-fellows—and the private Opinions of *St. Augustin* and *Optatus*, in favour of those Pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Lay-Persons, who *never were Commission'd to Baptize*; but I have already consider'd these in their proper Places, and therefore have no need here to repeat the Arguments brought against them; since 'tis plain, by all that has been hitherto said, that these Pretended Baptisms are *utterly Destitute of the general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, whereon to found their Pretended Validity.*

C H A P. VI.

That the Ancient Churches, who allow'd of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not reckon those Baptisms to have been Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd Anti-Episcopal Lay-Baptisms.

§ I. **I** Am oblig'd thus far to Concern my self with the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, because our Reverend Historian endeavours to represent them, as of the *same Nature* with *Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*: The Terms he makes use of, and his Assertions about them being such, as will *easily* induce *some* sort of *Readers*, who have not been Conversant in these Matters, to believe, that when the Ancient Churches allow'd of the Validity of *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms, they did it upon the *same Principle* which some now hold, for the *pretended Validity* of false Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who *never were* *Episcopally Commission'd to Baptize*: Thus, for Example, Mr. Bingham says of the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, That they were “*Un-*”
 “*authoriz'd* ;” That “*Hereticks and Schismaticks,*”
 “*and Degraded Clergy-men, had not any Legal Au-*”
 “*thority from the Church to Baptize* ;” — That
 “*They acted not only without her Authority,*”
 “*but against her Authority, in all their Mini-*”
 “*strations, Page 51. although their Baptisms were*”
 “*receiv'd as Valid, under such an Irregular, and*”
 “*Unlawful Administration,*” pag. 52. — “*What they*”
 “*did*”

“*did was done (properly speaking) by an Unautho-
 “ 213^d, Criminal, Anti-Episcopal Usurpation,
 “ &c.”* pag. 54. Such Terms as these naturally
 lead an *uncautious Reader* into this Notion, that
 those Ancient Heretical, and Schismatical Bap-
 tisms, were of the same Nature with our Anti-
 Episcopal, Unauthoriz^d Lay-Baptisms; for by
 such Colours as these, they have an *appearance* [yet
 ’tis but an appearance] of being *utterly destitute* of
 any Commission at all, *as much* as our Lay-Bap-
 tisms are, that are perform’d by Persons who never
 were at all Authoriz^d or Commission’d for that
 Purpose.

§ II To give the Reader therefore a fair In-
 sight into this Matter, it is to be observ’d, that
 there were two Sorts of Discipline in the ancient
 Churches about *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Bap-
 tisms.

First, That of the *Cyprianick Churches*, who made
Ecclesiastical Laws, that if the Clergy fell into He-
 resy or Schism, their *Ordinations*, and other *Mini-
 strations*, should be null and void; and that con-
 sequently the Baptisms given by them, during their
Heresy or Schism, should be look’d upon as *no Chri-
 stian Baptism*: And therefore Persons so baptiz’d by
 them, should, upon their Repentance and Recon-
 ciliation to the Church, be receiv’d by Baptism as
Heathens were.

Agrippinus *, Bishop of *Carthage*, in a Synod of
 the Provinces of *Africa* and *Numidia*, establish’d
 this Discipline.

* Cypr. Epist. ad Quintum. 71.—p. 140. *Paris*.

So did also the Councils * of *Carthage*, under *St. Cyprian*, make *Ecclesiastical Laws*, whereby they reduc'd to *Lay-men*, those *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Clergy-men, who either separated from the Church after their Ordination, or were ordain'd among *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*; and they null'd all their *Baptisms*, as being destitute of *Authority* and *Commission*.

St. Cyprian's Colleague likewise, *Firmilian* † Bishop of *Cæsarea*, appeals to the Council of *Iconium*, held long before, for the Obligation and Necessity of this.

Dionysius, Bishop of *Alexandria*, “alleges the “*Decrees of the Councils of Iconium and Synada for “Confirmation*” of this Custom; as *Mr. Bingham* informs us, pag. 56. And the same *Dionysius* speaks of these Councils || as held long before his Days, and calls 'em the *Bishops populous* (or numerous) *Assemblies*.

Thus we see that the Invalidity of *Heretical* and *Schismatical Ordinations* and *Baptisms*, held by the *Cyprianick Churches*, was not matter of private Opinion only; but *Ecclesiastical Canon Law*, and Determination of Synods, whereby the Bishops of those Churches bound their Subjects so strictly to the Union of the Church, as that their Clergy should not break her Union by *Heresy* or *Schism*, under any less Penalty, than that of losing their *Holy Orders*: The *Commission* they receiv'd before in the Church, was made null and void by those Laws of the Church to which they ow'd Subjection; and if any of them were ordain'd by *Heretical* and *Schismatical Bishops*, those *Ecclesiastical Laws* condemn'd such *Ordina-*

* Epist. 72. ad Stephanum de Concilio, p. 141. Paris. Concil. Carthag. de Baptiz. Hæret. p. 352. Paris.

† Inter Cypr. Epist. 74. p. 159, 160. Paris.

|| Dionys. Epist. apud Euseb. Lib. vii. c. 7.

tions to be invalid, and so all their Ministrations, by the same Laws, were made to be of no *legal Force* or *Validity* in those Churches. And as for the Laity of those *Cyprianick* Churches, these Laws were of great Influence to keep them also in the *Unity* of the Church; because, by the Terror of those Sanctions, they plainly saw, that (tho' their Bishops did not pretend to *null and void* Baptism once receiv'd in the Church) yet they *invalidated* all *Ordinations* and *Ministrations* done out of the Church, as well as the Orders of their separating Clergy: And so the Lay-members of those Churches had no hopes, either of their Childrens receiving *Valid Baptism* in Heretical and Schismatical Congregations, or of receiving themselves any *Valid Sacrament* of the Lord's Supper: And therefore, during the Obligation of this strict Discipline, they had no great Temptation to leave the *Unity* of the Church, to joyn themselves to such *dangerous Societies*, as lay under this severe Censure of their *Spiritual Sovereigns* the Bishops, who, by their Power of *Binding* given them by Christ, had bound them by such *Disciplinary Laws*, decreed and enacted in **numerous Synods and Councils**. So that in Consideration of these *Synodical Decrees*, the Baptisms of the *Heretical and Schismatical Subjects* of those Churches were term'd **Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal**: And why may not the *Bishops* of Christ's Church make such *wholsome Laws*, if they see it fit, for the Government of their own Churches, when they do not impose them (as *St. Cyprian* * did not) upon other Churches,

* Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem

Churches, whose *Spiritual Governours* think it not fit to be *so severe* in the Discipline of their Churches; as 'tis plain the Churches did not, who acted otherwise than the *Cyprianick* Churches in this matter. For,

§ III. *Secondly*, The other sort of Discipline which was practis'd by the Churches who would not come up to the *Cyprianick Severity*, was, That they did not *null and make void* the Commissions of either. 1st, Those *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Clergy-men, who had been ordain'd in the Church: Or, 2^{dly}, of those who had been ordain'd only by *Heretical* and *Schismatical Bishops*: They receiv'd their Orders as *good and valid*, and their Baptisms in the Name of the Trinity, and other Ministrations, to be so too: So that, when they or any baptiz'd by them return'd to the Unity of the Church, they were receiv'd [as all other Penitents us'd to be] by Imposition of Hands; the Clergy, as Clergy-men, and the Laicks, as Lay-Christians already baptiz'd, without requiring any other *Ordination* or *Baptism*, than what they had receiv'd before.

Mr. *Fingham* is so well apprized of the Truth of this, that he himself acknowledges, *pag. 88.* upon the Question, Whether *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* be *Clergy-men* or *Lay-men*, *Priests* or not *Priests*, *Bishops* or not *Bishops*? and says, "When in the Discipline of the Church, it was thought proper to deprive them of the Power and Honour of their Places, yet even in that Case, the Church did

si atem Collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia & libertatis & Potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare, &c. *Concil. Carthag. de Baptizandis Hæreticis*, p 353. *Paris.*

not intend to deny the **Validity** of their **Ordination**.— He says also, in his *pag. 89.* That *Hereticks and Schismaticks, and degraded Priests, were allow'd to be Priests still.*— And *pag. 90.* “The Church indeed did not pretend wholly to cancel or annul their Ordination, or give them a new Ordination.” But further, whether Mr. Bingham had acknowledg'd this or no, [as we see he has] yet 'tis plain, that the Churches, who in their Practice differ'd from the Discipline of the *Cyprianick Churches*, made *no Laws* or *Ecclesiastical Canons* for the Nulling of the Orders of *Heretical and Schismatical* Clergy-men: So far from that, that the Great Council of *Nice*, in the 8th Canon, allows of the Ordinations of the *Novatian Schismaticks*. And in the *African Code*, Canons 68, 69, and 118, the Ordinations of the *Donatist Schismaticks*, are receiv'd for good and valid, as I have before noted, *pag. 21.* from all which 'tis notorious, that in the Discipline of those Churches, who allowed *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, in the Name of the Trinity, to be good and valid; the *Baptizers* who were *Heretical and Schismatical Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, had a *valid Commission to Baptize*; their Orders were *not null and void*; there were **no Laws** of those Churches to make them so; but, on the contrary, their *Ecclesiastical Laws* or *Canons* decreed them to be *indeleted*, that they remain'd valid, and so they were **not Laymen, Persons destitute of Commission**, but still *Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, with an *indeleted, unrepeal'd Commission* to Baptize. Consequently Persons baptiz'd by them, in *Herefy and Schism*, had in the *sense of those Churches* all the *external Requisites* of the Administration appointed by the *Institution of Baptism*, (and therefore insisted on by us)

viz.

viz. *Water*, the *Form* in the Name of the Trinity, and the *Commission* of the Baptizer; *these Three* were in all those Baptisms: And therefore, whatsoever Discipline those Churches us'd at the receiving of those Penitents, it had no reference to the *Nullity* of the *Commission* of the Baptizer, any more than it had to the *Nullity* of the *Water*, or of the *Form* of Baptizing.

§ IV. Hence it comes to pass, that all Mr. Bingham's Terms us'd by him, when he calls those Baptisms **Unauthoriz'd, Anti-Episcopal Usurpations, &c.** as before observ'd, must be understood in such a *qualified Sense* of those Words, as Men mean, when they speak of a Thing done by a Person in a *prohibited Circumstance*, yet in pursuance and by virtue of a *Commission* receiv'd by him, to *do that very thing*. Thus a Priest executing his *Commission* to baptize, in the prohibited Circumstances of *Opposition* to some lawful Command of his particular Bishop; of Disobedience to the Canons and Rubricks of the Church whereof he is a Member; or lastly, in the sinful Circumstance of *Heresy* or *Schism*; If that Church has no Ecclesiastical Laws or Canons to *null* and make *void* his Commission, during those sinful Circumstances; If that Church has not decreed his Commission, to be *ipso facto*, null and void in those prohibited Circumstances, then, the Baptism administer'd by him, in the Name of the Trinity, cannot properly be said to be **Unauthoriz'd**; for 'tis plain, he *had a Commission* when he baptiz'd, and therefore the Baptism it self was **Authoriz'd**: As neither can that Baptism, in strict Propriety of Speech, be call'd **Anti-Episcopal**, which was administer'd by a *Priest* or *Deacon*, who had at the Time of Baptizing, an

Episcopal Commission, and who did not set up a **Pretended Altar** Against **Episcopacy** it self; or Disown the **Divine Right** of the Apostolick, *i. e.* **Episcopal Order**; but acknowledg'd, submitted to, and depended on it, and receiv'd all Power, Commission, and Authority from **Bishops**, and **from them only**, to minister in Holy Things, how much soever they transgressed the Laws of God, and his Church, in other Instances, which was plainly the Case of the *Heretical* and *Schismatical Baptizers* we are now speaking of, who were no other than *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, Consecrated and Ordain'd by Bishops; and tho' *Heretics* and *Schismatics*, yet vested with *Episcopal Power and Authority*, so long as those Churches did not *Vacate*, Null, and *make void* the **Commissions** of them, or of the Bishops who were their **Ordainers**: So that, in the Direct and Proper Sense of the Words, the Baptisms they administer'd In the Name of the Trinity, cannot in the Sense of *those Churches* be call'd **Unauthoriz'd** and **Anti-Episcopal** Baptisms; for they were as much *Authoriz'd* and *Episcopal* then, as any Baptisms now given by *wicked Priests* *Episcopally* Ordain'd, and receiv'd by the Baptiz'd, in *Sinful Circumstances*. The *Circumstance* indeed, whether of *Heresy, Schism, or other Transgression* of the *Rules and Orders* of the Church, is doubtless *very Sinful*, and therefore *Unauthoriz'd*; and by reason of the Disobedience, may [in a remote Sense of the Word] be call'd *Anti-Episcopal* too, as it has a *Tendency* in its Consequences, to destroy the *just Authority and Power* of Bishops; but still this Circumstance, wherein the Baptism is administer'd, is not the *Ministration* it self; the *Ministration* is one thing, the *Circumstance* wherein 'tis given

given, is another; and that which can justly be charg'd on the Circumstance, cannot fairly be apply'd to the *Commission'd Ministration*; because, tho' the Circumstance of Heresy, Schism, &c. is certainly wicked and *unauthoriz'd*; yet the Ministration of Baptism with Water, In the Name of the Trinity, by a Person Vested with an *Episcopal Commission*, not Vacated, Null'd, or made Void by the Heresy or Schism, or by any Law of the Church, is, in *it self*, no other than that *Commission'd Baptism*, which the Church her self Administers; and it proceeds from Mr. Bingham's not duly attending to this *Distinction* between the *Authoriz'd Baptism*, and the *Circumstance* wherein 'tis administer'd, that he affirms "All the Baptisms of Hereticks, Schismaticks, and Degraded Priests, are Unauthoriz'd;" and that "It was agreed on all Hands, that Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergy-men had not any Legal Authority to Baptize, Page 51." when 'tis plain they had the Church's *Legal Authority*; since they were *Episcopally Ordain'd*, and the Church did not Null their Orders, by any of her Laws, but the contrary, as we have seen before; and since Mr. Bingham himself says of them, That "the Church did not intend to deny the Validity of their Ordination," Page 88. Thus, running into Inconsistencies and Contradictions, for want of a due Regard that ought to be had, to the Difference between a Thing and its Circumstance only.

§ V. It is from hence that our Reverend Historian thus concludes his Account of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms in his 91st Page, "Upon the whole (says he) the Result of our Enquiry concerning

cerning Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergy-men, is this;

“First, They all act in Opposition to the Church’s Lawful Authority, and therefore have not her Lawful Authority to Baptize.” In Answer to which, ’tis evident by all that has been said upon this Subject, that the Cyprianick Churches, did, by Ecclesiastical Laws, enacted in numerous Synods of their Bishops, make Null and Void the Commissions of their Heretical and Schismatical Clergy; so that, by Virtue of those Laws, they were, by those Churches, reckon’d to be *destitute of Authority and Power* for Sacred Ministrations, during their *Schism or Heresy*: But the other Churches, who would not come up to the Cyprianick Discipline in this Matter, made no such Nullifying Laws, but the contrary; and therefore, their Heretical and Schismatical Subjects of the Clergy had not their Commissions, which they at first receiv’d of the Church, made Null and Void, but they remain’d still *Indeleted, not Vacated*, by the Church; and therefore they had still her *Lawful Authority*; for if they had it not, then ’tis plain they had not her Authority at all, for her Authority is no other than a **Lawful One**; if they had not her Authority, then they had not her Commission; if they had not her Commission, then they had no *Episcopal Commission*, for her Commission is only *Episcopal*; if they had no *Episcopal Commission*, then they were but *Laicks*; if they were but *Laicks*, then they were *No Priests*, and their Ordination was *Null and Void*; when yet Mr. Bingham says, “The Church did not intend to Deny the Validity of their Ordination, Page 88. and that “They were allow’d to be Priests still, Page 89. He goes on and says,

“Secondly,

“ Secondly, *Notwithstanding this* [i. e. notwithstanding their not having the Church’s Lawful Authority to Baptize] “ *their Baptisms, if done in* “ *due Form, are Valid, and not to be repeated.*”

But the Discipline of the Cyprianick Churches did not allow this; for as *they* vacated their Commissions, so in consequence thereof they null’d their Baptisms too; but the other Churches, as they did *not null* their Commission and Authority, so neither did they make *void their Baptisms*; and since they were Commission’d Baptisms, no wonder they stood good and valid in those Churches. Mr. Bingham proceeds,

“ Yet, Thirdly, *Those Baptisms have great Deficiencies, particularly, that they do not minister Remission of Sins, and other invisible Graces of the Holy Spirit*——which Deficiencies are to be “ *supply’d* by Imposition of Hands, and Invocation “ *of the Holy Spirit, upon their* [i. e. the Baptized’s] “ *Repentance, and return to the Catholick Church: And this, whether Hereticks acting in* “ *that Capacity be consider’d,*

“ Fourthly, *Either as Clergy-men or Lay-men,* “ *or in a middle State betwixt both, &c.*” But our Reverend Historian do’s not here distinguish: For the Great Deficiencies he speaks of, are not in *those Baptisms* themselves, properly speaking; for he may remember, what himself says of Baptisms wickedly circumstantiated, even in the Church it self, viz. that “ *the same Deficiency* was many times “ *in the Baptism of those who were baptiz’d in the* “ *Church, because they were baptized in Enmity* “ *and Hatred of their Brethren, and in that State* “ *could not have Forgiveness of Sins.* See his 81st Page. Mr. Bingham sure do’s not mean that these

these Baptisms *in the Church*, have in themselves, this great Deficiency; no, they have certainly no Deficiency at all, the Fault is only in the Circumstance, *not in the Baptism*; the Persons baptiz'd, as himself acknowledges, "*are hereby made Partakers of all such Privileges, as the receiving the outward and visible Sacrament of Baptism can give to such as debar themselves (by some Obstacle of their own) from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it*, Page 77. The Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it, is the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of the Baptism it self, that which is inseparably annex'd to it. "*But this Grace is not receiv'd.*" That is very true; but the reason why 'tis not receiv'd, is not from any Deficiency in the Baptism, for 'tis [according to Mr. Bingham] the Sinner's "*Own Obstacle*," and by this he "*Debars*" himself from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of the Baptism. This Circumstance of Wickedness in the Sinner is the *Causa impediens*, the Obstacle or Impediment which Obstructs the Divine Influence of the *Spiritual Grace*, and therefore hinders the Baptized from receiving it; the Baptism it self is Efficient, and has no Defect; but the Recipient is not at present capable, by reason of his Sin, to receive the *Spiritual Benefits annex'd thereto*; take away this Obstacle, by a *sincere and hearty Repentance*, and the inward Spiritual Grace will be received by Virtue of the former Baptism. This is the Case of some wicked Persons who are baptiz'd even in the Church it self; and Mr. Bingham cannot deny, but in the Sense of those Churches, this also was much the same, with respect to the Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms we are speaking of; for he, from St. Augustin's Authority, "*supposes such as are Baptized*"

“ Baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks to be
“ much in the same State as bad Men in the
“ Church” — Nay, more he says, “ They need—
“ only Repentance and Absolution to return
“ to the Church again; the Seal and Character of
“ their Baptism remaining in this respect for ever
“ Indelible upon them, so as to qualify them to
“ be admitted ever after to Pardon and Forgiveness
“ upon a true Repentance. These are Privileges
“ that a wicked Man has by Virtue of his having
“ receiv’d the outward Form of Baptism, or the vi-
“ sible Sacrament in the Church, tho’ all the Time,
“ by his own Fault, he be destitute of Pardon of
“ Sins, and all the invisible Graces and Operations
“ of the Holy Spirit. As the Baptism of Simon Ma-
“ gus was a true Baptism, tho’ he was an Unworthy,
“ and therefore an Unprofitable Receiver of it;
“ and as the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a true
“ Sacrament, tho’ many Men eat it, not to their
“ Soul’s Health, but to their own Damnation, be-
“ cause they are unworthy Receivers of it. Now
“ as the Case was with wicked Men, who thus re-
“ ceiv’d Baptism in the Church. — So the
“ Ancients supposed the Case of those to be who
“ were baptized — by Hereticks or Schis-
“ maticks, &c. Their Baptism, if done in due
“ Form — was the visible Sacrament of
“ Baptism — and qualified them for some, if
“ not all of the forementioned Privileges, so that
“ upon their Repentance and return to the Church
“ — the Church by Imposition of Hands and In-
“ vocation of the Holy Spirit, might obtain for them
“ those Blessings and Graces, which might have been
“ had in Baptism, if they themselves had not been
“ the Obstacle, and put in a Bar against them. This
“ Mr. Bingham takes to be the true State of this
“ Matter,

“*Matter, as generally deliver’d by such of the Ancients, as defended the Validity of Heretical Baptism.*” See his 77th, 78th, and 79th Pages. And to this also we do agree, in consideration, that those Ancients did likewise acknowledge the *Validity of the Episcopal Orders* of the Baptizers, consequently that their Baptism was *Episcopally Authoriz’d Baptism*; therefore that it had *no Deficiency in it self*, all the Fault being only in the *Circumstance* of the *Heresy*, or *Schism*, wherein their Ministrations were perform’d; so that this sinful Circumstance, this *Obstacle*, which (to use Mr. Bingham’s own Words) “**Put a Bar against**” the Spiritual Graces of those Baptisms, and hinder’d the receiving of them, being remov’d and taken away by the *Repentance* of the Baptized and *their return to the Church*; by *Imposition of Hands*, and *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, those Spiritual Graces then took place, and were receiv’d by the Baptized, without a Second Baptism, because the First had no Deficiency in its Ministration, but was *whole and entire*, being *Commission’d Baptism* with *Water*, In the Name of the Trinity: And when our Advocates, for the Baptisms we are disputing against, Baptisms by Persons *never Commission’d* at all to Baptize, can prove, that these false Baptisms given by our *Lay-Dissenting-Teachers*, are such *Episcopally Commission’d Baptisms*, as those Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were, **then we shall have done with this Dispute**; but till then, it must be acknowledg’d, that whatsoever can be fairly said for the Validity of those *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, which were Episcopal, is no ways applicable to these, which are not only *without an Episcopal Commission*, but are also in the most *direct and proper Sense* of the word

word *Anti-Episcopal*, in opposition to the very Order of Bishops; a Usurpation, this of so unheard of a Nature till of late, that the Ancient Catholick Church had *no Experience* of it; and consequently, could never have any *Tradition* or *Custom* in favour of its *pretended Validity*.

§ VI. By all that has been said, 'tis plain that *our Church of England* always had *Valid Baptisms*, because she *always had an Episcopal Commission* to baptize. Even when she was [as Mr. Bingham calls her] an Heretical and Schismatical Church, while under the Slavery of the *Romish Yoke*, her *Episcopal Commission* was good and valid, because there were no *Ecclesiastical Laws* or *Canons* of the Catholick Church, or of any Church to whom she may be suppos'd to have ow'd Subjection, that made her *Episcopal Commission* null and void upon the Account of her [suppos'd] Heresy or Schism; therefore all her Baptisms were *even then* good and Valid in *themselves*, being *Commission'd Baptisms* In the Name of the Trinity: They had **no Defect**, as they were the Sacrament of Baptism; whatsoever Deficiencies of Spiritual Graces she is suppos'd to have then labour'd under, were not owing to the Imperfection of the Sacrament, but to the Sinfulness and Ucharitableness of the suppos'd Heresy or Schism she is said to have been in: 'Twas only by this *Obstacle*, that those Spiritual Benefits can be suppos'd to have been *obstructed*, which *Obstacle* being remov'd by her *Repentance* and *Reformation*, those Spiritual Graces take effect; but her *Commission* it self is *no more* than it was before, the *Validity* thereof is just the same, only the *Obstacle* is now remov'd, which before [is suppos'd to have] hinder'd the receiving
of

of those Inward and Spiritual Graces, which are constantly annex'd to the Commission it self, whether the Commission'd Baptizer be **Wicked** or no; as our Church has taught us in her Twenty-Sixth Article.

§ VII. Before I conclude this Chapter, I must observe, that the *Rite of Imposition* of Hands, whereby Men who had formerly been Baptiz'd by *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Priests, were receiv'd into the Church, was not appointed to supply any *suppos'd Defect* in the Baptism it self which they had receiv'd, for it was the *Rite* whereby Penitents, even those that had been baptiz'd in the Church it self, were us'd to be receiv'd; it was the Ceremony of *Reconciliation*, and *Absolution*, and not us'd to give any *pretended Validity* to a Baptism, or Ordination, which was [*before such Imposition of Hands*] suppos'd to have been **Invalid**. And this was the Case of the *Schismatical Novatian* Clergy, whose Orders the great Council of Nice, which was a *General Council*, did not pretend to **make Valid** by Imposition of Hands; for Mr. *Bingham* himself observes in his 92d Page, That
 “ * the great Council of Nice decreed in the Case of
 “ the Novatians, that upon their Return to the
 “ Church, they should Continue in the same Sta-
 “ tion and Clerical Degrees they were in before,
 “ only receiving a **Reconciliatory** Imposition of
 “ Hands by way of **Absolution**,” which was plainly allowing the *Validity* of their Orders; and the Imposition of Hands was *Reconciliatory*, and by way of **Absolution**, according to Mr. *Bingham*; and the Canon has nothing in it, that supposes any

* Con. Nic. Can. 8.

Defect in the Ordination it self of the Novatian Schismaticks to be supply'd by Imposition of Hands. And when the Case of our Dissenters shall be prov'd to be the same with those Novatians; when their having no Episcopal Commission shall be prov'd to be the same with the Novatians, who plainly had one; then, and not till then, can a "Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by way of Absolution," be sufficient, for the receiving of our Dissenters as validly Baptiz'd Persons, in the Sense of the Catholick Church; for there are no Instances, that can be brought, to prove, that the Ancient Catholick Church ever receiv'd, by Imposition of Hands, without Baptism, such Persons as were only wash'd before, by those who were known (or suppos'd) to have been never Episcopally Commission'd to Baptize.

P C H A P.

C H A P. VII.

Mr. Bingham's Account of the suppos'd Practice of Lay-Baptism by the Modern Greeks, Muscovites, and Foreign Reform'd, Examined; and prov'd to be no Evidence of the General Sense and Practice of the Church.

§ I. **O**UR Reverend Historian begins his Account of the Modern Greeks, with telling us in his 101st Page, That “ in the Greek Church there has been some Dispute about this Matter, [i. e. of Lay-Baptism] and some seeming Variation in the Decrees of their Councils, tho’ they have more generally agreed with the Latins so far, as to allow the Baptism of Lay-men in Cases of Extreme Necessity.

His first Instance is from the Time of the Patriarch Nicephorus, in the beginning of the Ninth Century, whose two Canons allow of Baptism by a Christian Lay-man, “ where there is no Priest.” Mr. Bingham reckons, “ this was the declared Sense of the Greek Church, Authentically deliver’d in those two Canons made in a Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were present, if the Council of Constantinople, Anno 814. was the Council in which these Canons were made, Page 105.—In his 102d Page he produces Georgius Hamartolus, about the Year 840. making “ a bitter Invective against the Lawfulness of this, as either not knowing the Decrees of Nicephorus, or else as Contemning and insulting them, Page 103.—
That

That in the Twelfth Century “there were some
 “who made **Opposition** to them; for Michael
 “Glycas, about the Year 1120. takes occasion to
 “urge several Arguments against the **Validity** of
 “Lay-Baptism in any Cases of **Necessity** what-
 “soever, Page 104.—That “about 100 Years
 “after, one Theodorus Scutariota, maintain’d the
 “Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, Page 105.—That,
 “that which seems—to bear down the foresaid
 “Authority [of Nicephorus’s two Canons] is ano-
 “ther Decree made in the Council of Constantinople,
 “under Lucas Chrysoberges the Patriarch, An. 1166.
 Mr. Bingham acknowledges, That “this Council
 “cannot be deny’d to speak plainly against the Va-
 “lidity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of [what he
 calls] “Re-baptization, in the Case that was then
 “laid before them, which was the **Ordinary Mi-**
 “nister of Baptism by such as counterfeited Or-
 “ders, and pretended to be **Priests**, when they
 “were not so, Page 106.—That “the **Best Greek**
 “**Writers** of late Days, in speaking of the Mi-
 “nister of Baptism and the Practice of their
 “Church, always except the Case of Extreme Ne-
 “cessity, in which they allow a Lay-man, or **Wo-**
 “man to Baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die
 “without Baptism.” He produces “Jeremy, the
 “late Patriarch of Constantinople,” as allowing
 of this; also another “Evidence from what Suice-
 “rus has observ’d out of Metrophanes Critopu-
 “lus, a late Writer of that Communion; Arcu-
 “dius’s Remark out of Gabriel Severus, Arch-Bi-
 “shop of Philadelphia;” and lastly, our Learned
 Dr. Smith, who gives this Account from one of
 their Publick Confessions of Faith, Printed 1662.
 “That it is not Lawful and Proper for any One to
 “Baptize, but a **Lawful Priest**, Except in a
 P 2 “Time

"Time of Necessity, and then a Secular Person,
 "whether Man or Woman, may do it, Page 107,
 108.

These are Mr. Bingham's Evidences for the Practice of the *Greeks*; and now let us see the Force of their Testimony, as to the Matter we are enquiring about, which is, whether the *Ancient Catholick Church* has any Law, Tradition, or Custom, for the Validity of *pretended Baptism*, by Persons never Commission'd to baptize; for if we don't keep our Eye upon this, we shall be *very apt* to wander from the *great Point* now in Debate.

§ II. It is then to be observ'd, that in Mr. Bingham's whole *Scholastical History*, there is not so much as **One Instance** of the *Greek Church's* having ever attempted to Authorize *their Lay-men* to baptize in Case of Necessity, for the *first Eight Hundred Years* of Christianity, nor any Proof that the *Greek Church* ever had in that Period any *pretended Baptisms* by Persons never Commission'd to baptize.—So that, for the *first Eight Hundred Years*, that Church has *no Rule, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom*, whereby to determine the pretended Validity of any Lay-Baptisms whatsoever; and this Negative is a good Argument, that the *Validity* of Baptism by *Laicks*, never was the *General Sense and Practice* of the *Ancient Catholick Church*; for, if the *Ancient Catholick Church* had esteem'd it so, it is a most unaccountable thing, to find *nothing of this* attested to by the *Greek Church* for *Eight Hundred Years* together, when we consider the **Great Extent** of that Church, that it was *so Significant* a Part of the *Catholick Church*, as that the most celebrated and most receiv'd Councils were

were held in it; and when we consider also the *Great Number* of *Greek Authors*, whose *Writings* make so remarkable a Figure as they do, among the *Works* of the *Primitive Fathers*; and who, both *Councils* and *Greek Fathers*, are thus silent for *Eight Hundred Years* together, in so *Important a Matter*, as this of the pretended general Sense and Practice of the Church, in favour of Baptism by Laicks, must needs have been, if it had ever been a *Catholick Tradition, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom.*

§ III. Add to this, that tho' there was such a *profound Silence* in the *Greek Church*, concerning *any Validity* in such Baptisms, for the first *Eight Hundred Years*; yet, there was **no such Silence** about their **Invalidity**; for, we have already seen, that *St. Chrysostom* and *St. Basil*, in the *Fourth Century*, pronounc'd them to be **Null and Void**. *St. Basil's Epistle*, wherein he affirm'd this, was a *Canonical Epistle*, and receiv'd into the *Code* of the *Greek Church*, as part of their *Canon Law*; so that this was the Sense of the *Ancient Greek Church*, and was never oppos'd by any *Greek Council*, or the contrary taught by any of the *Greek Fathers*, till the *Time* of the *Corrupt Ages* of the Church; when other **Superstitions** very dangerous to *Christianity*, crept into the *Greek*, as well as into the *Latin Church*.

§ IV. *Mr. Bingham* begins his Account of the suppos'd Practice of the *Greek Church* (as to Lay-Baptism) in the *Ninth Century*, one of the most corrupt and superstitious *Ages* of the Church; wherein the Practice of the **Worshipping of Images** was carried on, both in the *East* and *West*

with a high Hand; and **Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, [our Reverend Historian's Author] was a very zealous Promoter of *this Superstition*, inſomuch as to *Suffer* and Die in Banishment for it, as if it had been the *Cause of God*; which is no *great Reputation*, to his *supposed two Canons*, produced by our Reverend Historian in favour of Lay-Baptism; and his *Authority* is of no *more Value* in this Case, than it is in the other, of the Use of *Images* in Divine Worship.

§ V. 'Tis true, Mr. *Bingham* glories in this as
 “ the Declared Sense of the Greek Church authen-
 “ tically deliver'd in these two Canons, made in a
 “ Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were pre-
 “ sent, **If the Council of Constantinople,**
 “ Anno 814. was the Council in which these Canons
 “ were made, [says he] Page 105.” But the Rea-
 der may easily see, that Mr. *Bingham* dare not say,
This was the Council; he puts it only upon
 the weak Foundation of an, “ **If the Council of**
 “ Constantinople, &c.—was the Council, in which
 “ they were made.” Our Reverend Historian do's
 not so much as *attempt to prove*, that those two
Canons were made in *that Council*; and there-
 fore we may fairly conclude, that *it is not to be*
prov'd; this Gentleman however shews his Inclina-
 tion to have it so, but it is no ways becoming
 a *faithful Historian*, to prejudice his Readers with
If's, May-be's, and Perhaps's, so frequently
 as our Author do's; because, abundance of People
 do not so much mind every single word, [**If,**
Perhaps, &c.] but that they may be carried

* *Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History*, Cent. IX. p. 1, 5.

away with a Belief of what is annex'd to such "If's and **May-be's**," especially, when the rest of the words are *big and ostentatious*: As here, we have the glaring shew, of "*The declar'd Sense of the Greek Church Authentically Deliver'd, and a Patriarchal Council of 270 Bishops;*" these are *great Things*, apt enough to fill up the whole Imagination of *many careless Readers*, who may neglect the **If** to which they are join'd: But let us a little enquire, what reason *Mr. Bingham* has *thus partially* to Name **this**, any more than the *other Councils*, said to have been held by *Nicephorus*? Nay, upon what good Foundation he could suppose those two Canons, to have been made in any *Authentick Council* at all?

Nicephorus was made Patriarch of *Constantinople*, Anno 806; in that same Year a * Council was held at *Constantinople* about the Restoration of *Joseph* the Steward of that Church to his Office, out of which he had been turn'd by *Nicephorus's* Predecessor *Tarasius* the Patriarch; and there are *no Records* of any such Canons made in that Council.

In the Year 809. *Nicephorus* held another † Council, "In which *Joseph* was not only Confirm'd in his Place, but the second, **Adulterous, Marriage** of *Constantine Copronymus* the Emperor, who after he had divorc'd his Wife, married another nam'd *Theodota*, was declar'd Lawful, by Dispensation, and every one that should maintain the contrary was Anathematiz'd." Neither did this Council make those Canons; and if

* *Du Pin's Chron.* IX. Cent.

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist.* Cent. IX. p. 5.

they had, 'twould have been but very little to their *Reputation*, to have been decreed by those who could **Confirm** even **Adultery** it self.

In the Year 813. *Leo Armenus* possess'd himself of the Empire, and was Crown'd by *Nicephorus* the 11th of (a) *July*. This *Leo* declar'd against **Image Worship** in favour of the *Iconoclasts*, who were (b) *Nicephorus's* *Enemies*, upon the account of his great *Zeal* for that *Superstition*. "The Emperor resolving to root out that *Corruption*, consulted with *Antonius* Metropolitan of *Silea*, to assist him in this (c) *Design*, promising to make him Patriarch of *Constantinople* instead of *Nicephorus*, which *Antonius* promis'd the Emperor he would." *Du Pin*, in his *Chronicle* of the Ninth Century, says, "that this Year, 813. was held the Council of *Constantinople*, against *Antonius* of *Silea*." *Labbe* says 'twas in the (d) Year 814. and that it consisted of 270 Bishops; so that this must be the Council *Mr. Bingham* speaks of. Now 'tis plain, that there appears to have been no other Business transacted at that Council, but the *Anathematizing* of *Antonius*, for endeavouring to put down *Image Worship*. There are no such **Canons** of that Council Extant; and therefore *Mr. Bingham* has no more reason to suppose *Nicephorus's* two **Canons** to have been made in this Council, than he has to affix them to either of the other two Councils held by that Patriarch.

(a) *Du Pin's Chron. IX. Century.*

(b) *Du Pin's Eccles Hist. Cent. IX. p. 1.*

(c) *Concil. Labbei, Tom. 7. p. 129.*

(d) *Ib. d. 1290.*

There was another Council at *Constantinople*, Anno 814. but it was held by the *Iconoclasts* [Opposers of Image Worship] after *Nicephorus's* Banishment for his superstitious Zeal to promote and uphold that great Corruption, when *Theodosius* the *Iconoclast* was made Patriarch in his stead, who presided in that Council; so that *Nicephorus*, to be sure, neither would, nor could sit in that Council, and consequently his *two Canons* were not made there; in short, they cannot be prov'd to have been made by him in any Council at all; and therefore our Reverend Historian can hardly clear himself from the Imputation of Partiality, when he pitches upon *the Council* against *Antonius*, rather than any other, and all because of the great show that it makes of 270 Bishops; who, if they had made these *two Canons*, would have no more shew'd the Sense of the Ancient *Catholick Church* in this Matter, than they did in the other of *Image Worship*, when they Anathematiz'd a Bishop for opposing that great Superstition.

§ VI. It is true, that immediately after this Council, Anno 814. *Labbe* places Seventeen Canons of *Nicephorus*, among which are the two Canons we are speaking of; but then 'tis as true, that *Labbe* do's not reckon them as *Acts* of that Council, but acknowledges that * he took them from the same Author as our Reverend Historian receiv'd them, viz. from *Leunclavius*; and that he

* *Concil. Labb. Tom. 7. p. 1200.* Eidem quoque subjiciemus Leges Synodicas ab eodem *Nicephoro* Sanctitas ex *Libro III. Tom. 1. Juris Græco Romani* à Joanne Leunclavio Concinnati: neque enim Indagare ullatenus potuimus ad quem potissimum Annum sint revocandæ.

could not at all affix them to any particular Year wherein they were made, and therefore by consequence to no *particular Council*.

Labbe indeed calls 'em *Synodical Laws*, but *Leunclavius* from whom he took 'em, gives 'em no other Name than only *the * Canons of Nicephorus the Confessor*, and says nothing of their having been made in any *Synod* at all. But some are apt to think they were decreed in a *Synod of Bishops*, because they are found in *Leunclavius's* Third Book, which bears this Title, [Lib. III. *Qui continet Sententias Synhodaes, & Sanctiones Pontificias Archiepiscoporum & Patriarcharum Constantinopolis.*]

“ The Third Book, containing the *Synodical Judgments*, and Pontifical Decrees of Arch-Bishops, and Patriarchs of *Constantinople* : ” In which 'tis to be observ'd, that *Leunclavius* gives his Reader to understand, that in his Third Book he had collected two sorts of Decrees ; First, Those which were made in Councils at *Constantinople*. Secondly, Others that were made by particular Arch-Bishops and Patriarchs of that *See*. When they are Canons or Decrees of Councils, he expressly calls them so ; when they are Constitutions of *Particular Patriarchs*, or *Arch-Bishops*, he entitles them as such, and does not give Notice of any Council whatsoever as having appointed them : Thus for Example, in his Third Book, Page 186. he gives us a Constitution of *St. John Chrysostom*, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, and do's not call it *Synodical*. In Page 187. he has a *Synodical* One, made by *Gennadius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in a Council assembled there with him, and so *Leuncla-*

* *Leunclav. Jus Græco. Rom. Vol. 1. Lib. III. p. 196.*

vius expresse it; but when he gives us *Nicephorus's* Canons, he only calls 'em "*Canons of Nicephorus the Confessor*," as I have before observ'd, without saying that they were ever made *in any Council*, and he is remarkably particular in this Distinction; so that, since there is no Council to which these two Canons can be *appropriated*, we may conclude, that they were made by no other than *Nicephorus* himself; and every Body who has look'd into Ecclesiastical History, knows that particular Popes, Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Abbots, &c. have made many Canons by their own Authority, without any Councils assembled, and concurring with them in those Canons.

§ VII. Add to this, that these two Canons are not to be found in the Collection of *Nicephorus's* Thirty Seven Canons, nor in that of his Nine Canons, both publish'd by * *Cotelerius*; only *Leunclavius* (from *Harmenopulus*) in his Collection of the *Greek and Roman Laws*, has publish'd Seventeen Canons, attributed to *Nicephorus*, all which are in *Cotelerius's* Collections, except the 2d, 3d, 9th, 12th, 13th, and 16th of the Seventeen: These Six Canons look very suspiciously, being mix'd with Eleven others, which Eleven are found in the former Collections, *when the Six are not be found in them*; among these Six are the Two Canons for Lay-Baptism, about which we are disputing, *viz.* the 13th and 16th of the Seventeen; so that their being *Nicephorus's*, is founded only upon the single Testimony of *Harmenopulus*, who

* *Inter Monumenta, Eccles. Græc. Tom. 3. P. 445.*

wrote his *Epitome of the Greek Canons* about the Year 1150. from whom *Leunclavius* says he took them; which Evidence, supposing it to be as good as can be desir'd, is **no Argument** that they were of any *Publick Authority*, as the *Authentick Sense* of the *Greek Church*, but only that they were the *Decrees of One Patriarch*. And we have seen that he was not so very exactly sound in *Principle* and *Practice*, but that he could be carried away with a false Zeal for the Promoting of Superstition, and did not scruple to ratify and confirm even **Adultery** it self.

§ VIII. But further, these Canons appear to have been but of very little, if of any Authority at all in the *Greek Church*; for if they had been the *declar'd Authentick Sense of that Church*: How should some of the *Greek Writers* [*who never were accus'd of Contumacious opposing the standing Rules and Orders of their Church*] write so zealously as they have done, against the **Lawfulness** of Lay-Baptism, even in Cases of *pretended Necessity*? As *Georgius Hamartolus*, about the Year 840. *Glycas*, Anno. 1120. and *Theodorus Scutariota*, Anno 1220. Sure these knew the *general Sense and Practice of the Greek Church*; and why should we believe they would have written so boldly against it, if this had been the *approv'd Lawful Sense and Practice thereof*? They plainly pass over and neglect these Two Canons, as if they never had been; or if they had any Knowledge of them, they look'd upon 'em only as the Opinion of one Man, to be only of Private, if of any Authority, and not the *declar'd Authentick Sense of the Greek Church*, which we may reasonably believe they would have been more tender of Opposing, if it had been
“ truly

“*truly Catholick and agreeable to the Word of God.*” Since Mr. *Bingham* do's not give us any Instance of their Contradicting the standing Rules and Orders of their Church in any other respect whatsoever.

§ IX. And great reason had those Writers so strenuously to oppose Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever; for the Institution it self gives not the least encouragement to such a Practice, but the contrary: St. *Basil*, in his Canonical Epistle to *Amphilochius*, part of the Canon Law of the *Greek Church*, pronounced such Baptism Null and Void; St. *Chrysostom*, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, did the same; these both in the Fourth Century: The Constitutions, call'd Apostolical, very much esteem'd by that Church, absolutely prohibit Laicks from meddling in such Holy Things; and the *Greek Church*, for the first Eight Hundred Years of Christianity, had nothing that favour'd such a Practice as that of Lay-Baptism; so that even if *Nicephorus*, Anno 814. had endeavour'd by his Patriarchal Authority to introduce such a Novelty, and those Writers had known of this his Design, yet they had good Foundation whereon to build their Arguments against it; especially, if we also consider that it was a Novelty of some of the *Latins*, and that the Emisseries of the Bishops of *Rome* were very early in their Attempts upon other Churches, particularly the *Greek Church*, to make them submit to their Erroneous Doctrines and Practices; for even St. *Basil*, in his Tenth Epistle, complains of the *Western Bishops* in his Days, particularly the *Roman*, [“*Quod veritatem neque Norunt, neque discere sustinent—*”
“*Cum iis qui veritatem ipsis annunciant Contenden-*”
“*tes,*”

“*ies; herasim autem per se ipsos stabilientes.*”]
 “That they neither know the Truth, nor care to
 “learn it; but they contend with them who tell
 “’em the Truth, and by themselves establish He-
 “refy.” Our *Nicephorus*’s familiar Correspondence with the then Bishop of *Rome*, Pope *Leo III.* whereof we have an Instance in * a Letter *Nicephorus* wrote to him, *Anno 811.* in which he acknowledges the Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images—and excuses himself to the Pope that he did not write to him sooner; and says, that the Cause was, that he was made to believe that the Church of *Rome* was at Enmity with that of *Constantinople*; but now the Cause of the Division being remov’d, he doubted not but there would be a perfect Agreement between the two Churches. I say, this and such like familiar Correspondence of *Nicephorus*, and other *Greeks*, with the Bishops of *Rome* then and afterwards, together with the restless Endeavours of the Bishops of that Church, to make other Churches submit to their Erroneous Doctrines and Practices, without which the Church of *Rome*, in her corrupt Ages, would have no perfect Agreement with any other Church; gave but too just occasion to others of the *Greek Church* who were jealous for the Truths of Christianity, to give that Church timely Warning of Dangerous *Romish* Novelties creeping in among them; of which Number *Georgius Hamartolus*, *Glycas*, and *Theodorus Scutariota*, appear to have been, in vigorously opposing the pretended Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism, which was first started only in the *Latin Church*; and in Defence of which, we have no In-

* *Du Pin IX. Cent.*

stance in the Primitive *Greek Church*: And *Nicephorus's* suppos'd Two Canons, in the Ninth Century, were but of his private Authority, and not at all regarded, but neglected and contemn'd, if they were so much as known by those Writers from the Year 840. to 1220.

§ X. But our Reverend Historian will have it that *Nicephorus's* Two Canons "*continued in force among the Greeks for some Ages after [the Year 840.]*" Page 103. Of this he is *very Positive*; and now let us see what is his Reason for it? Why truly no more than this, *viz.* "*For Harmenopulus, who lived in the middle of the Twelfth Century, and wrote his Epitome of the Greek Canons about the Year 1150. has inserted them both into his Collection; and they are the only Canons that are mention'd upon this Subject, which seems to argue, that they were then the standing Rule of the Greek Church,*" Page 104. This is his whole Argument; in which there are several things worth our Notice: *First*, That he asserts the Two Canons continu'd in force for some Ages, because they were inserted by a Writer, in his Collection of Canons, above Three Hundred Years after *Nicephorus*: This is just as good an Argument, as if I should say, that a Modern *English* Writer's collecting *Ancient English Canons*, made Three Hundred Years ago, whether by Men in the right or the wrong for making them, is a good Proof that such Old *English* Canons continued in force in the Church of *England* all that while, to the time of his Collecting them; the Weakness of which betrays it self. *Secondly*, He says they are the **Only Canons** that are mention'd upon this Subject: This confirms what I observ'd before, that there

there were none such in the *Greek Church* for the first Eight Hundred Years; and now they stand Singular by themselves for Three Hundred and Fifty Years after, during which Time we have not yet had so much *as one Argument*, that they were of any *standing Authority*, or Force in the *Greek Church*; the Practice countenanc'd by them was oppos'd very early after they are suppos'd to have been made, *viz.* by *Georgius Hamartolus* within Twenty Six Years after, and by *Glycas* not above Thirty Years before *Harmenopulus* collected them; so that in these Three Hundred and Fifty Years they made no Figure in the *Greek Church*, as *Lawful Constitutions* thereof, since they were either not known, or *contemn'd and despis'd*, by two Writers who are not accus'd of being either *Hereticks* or *Schismatics*, and who very well knew, and did not quarrel with, the *Lawful and Genuine Rules of their Church*.—But, Thirdly, *Harmenopulus's* inserting them in this Collection, and they being “the **Only Canons** mention'd upon this Subject, **seems** to argue, that they were then the standing Rule of the *Greek Church*.” First, Our Reverend Historian was **positive** that they continued in Force for some Ages; and for this Positiveness one would have thought he was going to introduce as Positive a Reason, when he begins it with a **For**, but at last he finishes with only, it **Seems**; so that all he has said to prove their continuing in Force for some Ages, amounts to no more, than that *Harmenopulus's* Collecting them do's but “**seem** to argue,” it is no convincing Argument that they were then the standing Rule of that Church, it only seems so; But Mr. *Bingham* must give us more than **Seeming Arguments** for the *Greek Church's Standing Rules, Ecclesiastical Law* and

and Canons about this matter; (all is not Gold that glisters) 'till our Reverend Historian proves them to be the *Authentick Constitutions* of that Church, we shall esteem those Two Canons not to have been the *Greek Church's standing Rule*, but a singular Innovation of no Publick Authority or Obligation.

§ XI. And now let us see what can be made of these Two Canons; why truly no more than this: That if *Bishops have Power* by Canon to authorize their own Lay-men to Baptize, in want of a Priest, (*which has not yet been prov'd that they have*) then *Nicephorus*, by these Two Canons, authoriz'd his *Greek Lay-men* for that purpose. And what would this be to us if it were so? Nothing at all certainly; for *his Canons*, even in that case, have *no Obligation* upon us: Our Lay-men can receive *no Authority* at all from them, and therefore they are of no Use in our present Controversie, which is, about the Validity of that *pretended Baptism* which is given by Persons, who, upon *no account whatsoever*, can be said to have been at all commission'd or authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize, if Bishops could so authorize their own Lay-Communicants.

§ XII. Before I proceed any farther I must take notice, that Mr. *Bingham* rejects all *Glycas's* Arguments against Lay-Baptism, and says of 'em from *Cotelerius*, That "*his Arguments are grounded upon several Mistakes in matters of Fact, which makes them weak and inconclusive,*" pag. 104. But because *Glycas* was mistaken in some Facts, nay some but pretended Facts; Do's it therefore follow that he has no good Argument against this Practice? Let us try one of that *Greek Writer's* Arguments

Q

guments, and see how our Reverend Historian can disprove it. "*Glycas alledges the Authority of the*
 "*Apostolical Canons prohibiting Lay-men to meddle*
 "*with the Priest's Office, whatever Cases of Necessity*
 "*may seem to require it.*" Mr. Bingham finds fault with this, and says, "*The Case of Necessity is never*
 "*so much as once mentioned in all the Apostolical*
 "*Canons or Constitutions; only Lay-men are severely*
 "*prohibited in general from thrusting themselves*
 "*into the Offices of the Ecclesiastical Function,*" pag. 104. Now who is there that do's not see, that Mr. Bingham, by this Observation, confirms *Glycas's* Allegation? "*The Case of Necessity is not once*
 "*mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Consti-*
 "*tutions,*" says Mr. Bingham; and I in return do say, that for this very reason, *Glycas* had good Authority to affirm, That "*Lay-men were prohibited*
 "*to meddle with the Priest's Office, whatsoever Cases*
 "*of Necessity may seem to require it.*" For, since the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions do not once mention, they consequently make no Provision for, any Case of Necessity whatsoever. And since *Lay-men are severely prohibited in general*, by Mr. Bingham's own Confession, therefore, this Prohibition is *absolute and unlimited*, it includes all Cases, and consequently the pretended Case of Necessity, because it *excepts none*; and all this because it relates to a Thing, which was never valid before 'twas *commission'd*, and owes its Validity to the Observation of the first Institution, which *annex'd it to a Commission*, and made no *Proviso* for its Validity *without a Commission* in any Case whatsoever: Therefore the **general Prohibition** of the Apostolical Canons, against Persons who have *no Commission*, includes even the suppos'd Case of Necessity, and excludes such Persons (as *Glycas* very well infers) from

from meddling in the Priest's Office, whatsoever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it. For there is no Case of Necessity that can **really** require it, because the Institution points at no such Case, nor makes any Provision for it; the worst Case may in some Mens Opinion *seem to require it*, yet it do's but *seem* to do so: For if we put them upon the Proof that the Case **certainly requires** it, they are at a *great stand*, and have no Arguments to produce for it; nay, so far from that, that some of 'em say, 'Tis *sinful* for an *uncommission'd Person* to meddle in it, when at the same time they *call it necessary*, and run themselves into the Contradiction of asserting the Necessity of a Sin, or that the Case is a Case of Necessity, and that some-body must supply it, tho' by sinning against the Law of God himself, as we have seen by some late Attempts about this matter, set forward by those, from whom we should least have expected them.

§ XIII. But to return to the *Greek Church*: It is plain, that hitherto we have found *no authentick Act of hers* giving Countenance to the suppos'd Validity of Lay-Baptism; and as for the Testimony of particular Writers of that Church, 'tis evident from what has been said, that the *Majority* is against the Validity thereof, so far as to the Year 1220, when *Theodorus Scutariota* maintain'd the Invalidity of such Baptism. Let us now see what the *Greek Church* assembled in Council has done, and her *Authentick Sense* against such Baptisms as those are, against which we are now disputing, *viz.* Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were Episcopally ordain'd, and who yet presume to reckon themselves as Ministers of Christ, and to Baptize as if they were really such.

In the Year 1166. there was a great Council at Constantinople *, where were present Three Patriarchs, Lucas Chrysoberges of Constantinople, Athanasius of Antioch, and Nicephorus of Jerusalem, with Fifty seven Metropolitans, besides other Bishops.— Mr. Bingham owns, that in this Synod, a “ Question was put by Manuel Arch-Bishop of “ Heraclea, ” “ Whether a Man ought to be re- “ ceived as a Christian, who was baptiz’d by one “ who pretended to be a Priest, but was not “ so? For such a Case had lately happened in his “ Diocese. In answer to this the Synod decreed, “ That such ought to be re-baptiz’d; because the “ Administration of Baptism is only committed to “ Bishops and Priests, according to the 46th and 47th “ Canons of the Apostles,” pag. 106. Our Reverend Historian acknowledges also, That “ this Council “ cannot be deny’d to speak plainly against the Vali- “ dity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of [what he calls] “ Re-baptization in the Case that was then “ laid before them, which was the ordinary Mini- “ stration of Baptism by such as counterfeited “ Orders, and pretended to be Priests when they “ were not so.” And this is most evidently our present Case; for our Lay-Baptisms are by Persons pretending to be in Orders who are not so, and they give their false Baptisms ordinarily, claiming the ordinary Ministration of Baptism: And therefore the declared, authentick Sense of the Greek Church, in a Synod of Three Patriarchs, Fifty seven Metropolitans, and other Bishops, is full and direct against the Validity, and positive for the Invalidity of their false Baptisms; and Mr. Bingham cannot produce any

* Cave Hist. Lit. Vol. 1. p. 676. Vol. 2. p. 418, 419.

one Council that was ever held, either in the *Eastern* or *Western Church* for the first Twelve hundred Years of Christianity, that he can prove would have decreed any otherwise than this Council did in this matter.

§ XIV. Our Reverend Historian seems not willing to believe, that the Decree of this Council was so *extensive*, as some of the Enemies of Lay-Baptism may be apt to believe; for he says thus, "*But whether they [i.e. the Members of that Council] intended by this, wholly to invalidate the Baptism of Deacons and Lay-men, in extraordinary Cases of absolute Necessity, when neither a Bishop nor Presbyter can be had; as they have not express'd themselves particularly upon this point; so it is more than I can pretend positively to determine,*" pag. 106. Here again Mr. Bingham repeats his artful but very *unfair* way of joyning **Deacons** with *Lay-men*, as if Deacons were no more Partakers of the Priestly Power, than Lay-men: But the Fallacy of this I have already sufficiently expos'd, and therefore shall here only speak of Lay men, *Persons never commission'd* by Bishops to baptize; and I do affirm, that Baptism by such Persons, tho' done when none of the Priesthood can be had, is by this *Synodical Act* declared *Null and Void*.

First, Because the Baptism by the *Pretender to Holy Orders*, who *deceiv'd* the baptiz'd, was to the Receiver, equivalent to a Lay-Baptism in want of a Priest, and esteem'd Null and Void by those Bishops; for, this pretended Baptism was as much a Case of Necessity to the baptiz'd, as if no Priest could have been had, because the *Deceiver* appear'd as a Priest; as such he was receiv'd by the baptiz'd, and he had, at the time of his Baptism, no

Medium by which to discover the *Fallacy*, and therefore 'twas to him equivalent to a Case of Necessity, because (by reason of the Delusion) he had no free Choice to be baptiz'd by a *Priest*; and therefore, since that Council would not admit this *pretendedly baptiz'd Person as a Christian* without *Sacerdotal Baptism*, and all because the Pretender had *no Priestly Character*, and for this *only reason too*; it must needs be, that they null'd a *pretended Baptism* receiv'd from a Lay-man, by one in a Case of Necessity, when he could (in his Circumstances) have no Priest to baptize him. And,

Secondly, The Reason given by that Council proves this Assertion; for they affirm'd expressly, That "*such ought to be re-baptiz'd, because the*" "*Administration of Baptism is only committed to*" "*Bishops and Priests, according to the 46th and 47th*" "*Canons of the Apostles.*" The Power of Baptizing being committed **only** to those who are vested with a *Priestly Power*, is made the Reason why *Priestly Baptism* was decreed to be given to him, who before was *falsely baptiz'd*, by one who had no *such Sacerdotal Power*; and this without distinguishing, that it might be otherwise in any Case whatsoever: 'Tis *absolute* and *unlimited* without any Exception, and therefore includes all Cases ordinary and extraordinary: 'Tis apply'd by the Council, particularly to the Case before us, which was an **extraordinary Case** to the pretendedly baptiz'd, by reason of the *Delusion* and *Cheat* put upon him; they did not decree in his favour, because he was thus deluded, and under that Circumstance could have no other Baptism, which made his a Case of Necessity; that therefore, because his was such a Case, his *false Baptism* was good and valid; no, they determin'd *only upon this Principle*, that there was really

no Priestly Power, therefore no Baptism; and for this reason, and this only, they decreed that he should be baptiz'd: It is not recorded, whether the counterfeit Priest pretended to minister *Ordinarily*, where true Priests were to be had, or *Extraordinarily* where they were Absent; and let the Adversary chuse which of them he will, the Case was still the same to the pretendedly Baptized; for, the false Baptizer made him believe, that he was such a One as could give True Baptism; and the Baptized being deceiv'd, took him for such. If true Priests were to be had, he esteem'd the counterfeit One, under his Delusion, as true, and therefore as eligible, as any of them, and so saw no Necessity of Addressing to One of them for Baptism, rather than to him; which put him under a *Necessity* of being supposedly baptiz'd by him: And if true Priests could not be had, it would but have been the *same Case of Necessity*; but notwithstanding, upon sifting the Matter, 'twas only the *want of Commission*, that was the reason of the Invalidity of the Baptism, in the Sense of that Council; and the Case is but just the same, when a Laick, a Person *never Commission'd* to baptize, attempts to give Baptism in an Extraordinary Case, where Priests are not to be found; for, the Laick's *Open and Known Usurpation*, of what was never Committed to him, do's *no more vest him with a Commission*, than the covert and sly Pretences of the counterfeit Priest, [who is no Priest at all] do's Authorize him; they are both *equally without any Commission*; and the Absence of true Priests, do's not give any Advantage to the Lay-Usurper's Case; for, *this Negative* can confer *no Positive Power or Authority* to baptize; the Laick never had it before, for such a Case, either by the *Law of Nature*,

ture, for *that* has nothing to do in the Matter; or by the Law of God, for *that* never vested him with it; or lastly, by any suppos'd *Donation* of the Catholick Church, or of the Bishops, to whom he owes Subjection, [if either the *Catholick Church*, or those Bishops, could make such a *Donation*, or Gift of Power, to Laicks;] consequently this Laick, in Absence of the Priests, is *as much without a Commission*, as the counterfeit Priest was; and since this Council decreed, the pretended Baptism administer'd by the counterfeit Priest, to be Null and Void, "*because the Administration of Baptism was never Committed to him,*" and he had therefore **No Priestly Character**; it necessarily follows, that the same Decree censures pretended Baptism to be Null and Void, when given by a Laick, one *never Commission'd to Baptize*, tho' done in *Destitution* and want of *Priests*, because the Laick, even in this Case, has *no more a Commission* than the *Counterfeit Priest*: The Ministration of Baptism was no more Committed to this Laick, than it was to that Impostor; they are both *equally Laicks*, both exactly alike, *Non-Commission'd*.

And if any favourable Construction may be made for *pretended Baptism* by one, rather than by the other, to the Advantage of the supposedly Baptized; it is more equitable to allow of that which was perform'd by the **Counterfeit Priest**, than to acquiesce in that, which was done by the known *presumptuous Lay-man*; because, the supposedly Baptized has a better colour of Excuse, by reason of the *Cunning* of the Impostor, and the *great Difficulty*, if not *Impossibility* (under his Circumstances) of discovering the Cheat, when he had *no Suspicion* of it, nor any Grounds given why he should

should suspect the *Administrator's Commission*; when on the other hand, the presumptuous to Lay-man, who puts on no Disguise, is easy be discover'd; for the People are us'd to receive Baptism from the Hands of the Priests, they know 'tis their Office to give it, so that when a *known Laick* presumes to do it in any Case whatsoever, there's something shocking in it, and the meanest unprejudic'd understanding of those Men, who are used (as all ought) to study their Bibles, may easily see, that *No Appearance of Necessity* can vest Men with that Sacred Office which God has appropriated to others, to minister in Holy Things; and therefore, they are in such Case, *less excusable* for submitting to such *open unwarranted Usurpations*. But this Council of *Constantinople* used no such false Judgment, they decreed the false Baptism, given by the *Cunning Impostor*, to be Null and Void, notwithstanding all the pleadable Difficulty of suspecting or discovering the Cheat; and consequently the same Determination stands good, against the Validity of pretended Baptism, given (tho' in Absence of the Clergy) by known Lay-men, Persons never Commission'd to baptize; because there is *less colour* for Excuse, in favour of those who receive these false Baptisms, than there is in behalf of such as are almost unavoidably deluded, by the other *Cunning and Subtile Pretenders*. But without favouring one more than the other, they are both equally without Commission; and therefore by this *Greek Council* their *Ministrations* are both Null and Void.

§ XV. Our

§ XV. Our Reverend Historian says, Page 106. "If it was so [*viz.* if this Council design'd to Invalidate such Lay-Baptisms] "then I can say, "it was plainly contrary to the Decrees of the "Former Council under Nicephorus, which "prevail'd in Practice both before and since this "Council, and still do's in the Greek Church to this "Day." And then he charges some Learned Persons with Error for thinking otherwise. But Mr. Bingham has not yet produc'd the Council which he talks of, he has given us nothing but an *If* for his supposed Council under Nicephorus; nay, he cannot prove that this Patriarch's Two Canons were ever made by any Synod at all, but yet he calls 'em the Decrees of the **Former Council**, very emphatically, as if he had given Proof of some particular Synod wherein they were made, which he has not at all done; so that Mr. Bingham is here very positive upon an **Uncertainty**, (to make the best of it) even in *direct Opposition* to what is **Evident and Certain**; for he insists upon a *supposititious Council's Decrees*, against an *undoubted Decree* of an Incontested, Indisputable Authentick Council; and would make us believe that the former (*tho' not prov'd*) were of most force, in that "they prevail'd in Practice, both before and since this **Certain and Undisputed Council**! How they prevail'd in Practice before, we have seen already; Mr. Bingham has hitherto produc'd no Evidence for this their suppos'd *Prevalency*; and if he had, it still wants to be prov'd that this Practice was founded upon the *general Sense of the Greek Church*, and not rather upon the *false Principles*, introduc'd among some *Latinizing Greeks*, by the Craft and Cunning

Cunning of Popish Emissaries, who have been continually endeavouring to corrupt that poor, oppressed, and afflicted Church: But this Council of *Constantinople*, held by Three Patriarchs, Fifty Seven Metropolitans, and other Bishops besides, is a *Glaring Evidence*, that this Corruption of Popery had not yet in the Year 1166. prevail'd in the *Greek Church*; for if it had, 'tis *inconceivable* how such a *Numerous Synod*, as that was, should make a Decree so directly contrary to the Popish Notion of Lay-Baptism.

§ XVI. But our Author goes on with his Endeavours to prove, that this Piece of Popery "*prevail'd in the Greek Church, since this Council, and still do's to this Day*; For (says he) *the Best Greek Writers of late Days, in speaking of the Minister of Baptism, and the Practice of their Church, always except the Case of Extreme Necessity, in which they allow a Lay-man, or Woman, to baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die without Baptism.*" And he instances *Jeremy Patriarch of Constantinople*, in the Sixteenth Century; *Suicerus's* Observation out of *Metrophanes Critopulus*; *Arcudius's* Remark out of *Gabriel Severus*, Arch-Bishop of *Philadelphia*, and our *Dr. Smith's* present State of the *Greek Church*.

§ XVII. In Answer to all which 'tis evident, that our Reverend Historian's *Best Greek Writers*, as he calls 'em, have betray'd themselves to be *Uncatholick* in their Principles; and the Practice they speak of, to be also *Uncatholick and Popish*; for they espouse the Cause of *Baptism by Women*, whom *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges never to have been allow'd by the *Ancient Church* to Baptize:

tize: This shows of what Party those *Greeks* are, who allow of this, and that they learn'd and took it from the corrupt Church of *Rome*, the known *Promoter* and *Abettor* of this Erroneous and *Uncatholick* Practice; but the Authors mention'd by our Historian, are no more than *particular Men*, and their *Authority* of no Importance against that of the Council of *Constantinople*, Anno 1166. And 'tis very Notorious, that in these latter Ages the *Greeks* are, by the Craft and Subtilty of the *Romish* Emissaries, divided into two Parties; one that adheres to the Principles and Practices of their *Ancestors*, the Ancient *Greeks*; and the other that embraces the Novelties and Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

Dr. *Smith*, in the Preface to his Account of the *Greek* Church, shews us how *Cyrillus Lucaris* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, 1621. by opposing the Designs of the *Jesuits*, got to himself the *Hatred* and *Ill-will* of the *Latinizing Greeks*; and from Page 239. and forward of that Book, how by the Instigation of the *Jesuits*, and Conspiracy of some *Greek Bishops*, he was *Prosecuted*, *Dethron'd*, *Banish'd*, and at last *Barbarously Murder'd*, An. 1638. In Page 249. we see how the *Romish Emissaries* and *Latinizing Greeks* bribe the *Turks* to get their own *Party-Men* advanc'd to the Patriarchate; there we find how the Church of *Rome* sends *Titular Bishops* among them, and how the *Romish Ambassadors*, as well as *Romish Priests*, disturb and rend that poor distressed Church, by Corrupting the *Greek Bishops*.

Sir *Paul Ricaut*, late Consul at *Smyrna*, in his Present State of the *Greek* and *Armenian* Churches, Anno 1678. tells us in his Preface, Page 15. that a Confession of Faith, suppos'd to have been written

ten

ten by *Cyrillus Patriarch of Constantinople* in the Year 1629. was believ'd in a great measure to have been father'd on him by the *Jesuits*, to render him odious both to *Greeks* and *Latins*.—In the 28th Page of his Book he assures us, that “*The Roman Priests frequent all Places where the Greeks Inhabit, endeavouring to draw them unto their side, both by Preaching and Writings, of which one being written in the Vulgar Greek by Francis Richard a Jesuit, and Printed at Paris, call'd, Τάγμα τῆς Ρωμαικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, was dispers'd in all Parts where that Language was Current. That, [Page 29.] Whereas now the Ancient Structures and Colleges of Athens are become ruinous—and all Greece Poor and Illiterate, such Spirits and Wits among them, who aspire unto Sciences and Knowledge, are forc'd to seek it in Italy; where sucking from the same Fountain, and eating Bread made with the same Leaven of the Latins, it is natural that they should conform to the same Principles and Doctrine. So that it will not be strange, if in Exposition of those Points wherein the Church of God for some Ages hath been silent, and but now controverted in these latter Days, the Greek Priests should with little Variety follow the Sense of the Latin, which they take up at adventure, not being of themselves capable either to prove or try the meaning of the Scriptures, or examine the Ancient Tenets of their own Church.*” And in Page 333. “*Italy is the sole Gymnasion and Library of their Knowledge and Learning; for in most Points of Controversy, where the Patriarchal Authority is not concern'd, they exactly concur with the Sense of the Roman Schools.*” And the Friars of the Church of Rome are so industrious

ous to make the World believe that the *Oriental Churches* are like their own, that the same Writer in his 447th Page assures us, that "*some*" Friars of the *Roman Church* perswaded the *Armenian Patriarch* and Bishops at *Constantinople* to subscribe a Confession agreeable to the Tenets of the *Roman Faith*—a Copy of which Sir *Paul Ricaut* saw and read, as it was deliver'd to him from the *Mertabet*, or *Armenian Bishop*.

Dr. *Smith*, in the 6th Page of his above-mention'd Preface, says, "*It is manifest to all who understand Antiquity, how much the present Greeks have in several Points of Doctrine varied from the Belief of their Ancestors, and have corrupted the Simplicity and Purity of Religion by odd Opinions and Fancies.*" So that 'tis now no wonder if we find some of their late particular Bishops Latinize so far, as to run into the Popery of Baptism by *Lay-men* and *Women*.

What Regard then is due to *Jeremias* the Patriarch's Opinion in this Matter, when he * was displeas'd with the *Lutherans* for believing "*Invocation of Saints to be vain and frivolous,*" and for despising that Adoration which is paid to their *Images and Holy Relicks*, as they are called? Mr. *Bingham* might with as good a Grace have produc'd that Patriarch's Testimony for these Popish Corruptions, as for the other; and the rest of his Instances are of so modern a Date, that we have reason to believe they are no better than the meer Effects, of some *Greeks* being too much infected with the Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

* *Du Pin's XVI. Cent. Tom. 2. p. 441. Lond.*

§ XVIII. Dr. Smith tells us, in the 109th Page of his Account of the Greek Church, “ They believe
“ *such an absolute Necessity of this Sacrament—as*
“ *that they entertain hard and cruel Thoughts*
“ *of the State of Infants, which by some Misfortune*
“ *and Casualty are depriv’d of it, to prevent which*
“ *Mischief, and secure their Fears, where there is a*
“ **real and certain Danger** *of imminent Death in*
“ *the Absence of a Priest, who is at all other times the*
“ **only Lawful Minister** *of this Sacred Rite, it is*
“ *allowed to Lay-Persons of either Sex, as it is ex-*
“ *presly laid down in their Publick Confession of*
“ *Faith, Written in the Vulgar Greek, and Printed*
“ *in the Year 1662.*” “ It is not lawful and proper
“ for any one to baptize but a lawful Priest, except
“ in time of Necessity ; and then a Secular Person,
“ whether Man or Woman, may do it.” By this
we see, that the **Reason** of this Practice of some
of the *Greeks*, is the *uncharitable and cruel Opinion*
which some of the *Romanists* hold of Infants dying
without Baptism, and which those *Greeks* have
learn’d from them: That the Practice founded upon
that Opinion, is no other than **Popish**, since
it allows **Women** as well as Lay-men to baptize;
which is a peculiar Practice of the corrupt Church
of *Rome*. And ’tis no sufficient Answer to say,
That this is the Sense of the *genuine Greek Church*;
because ’tis “ *expresly laid down in their Publick*
“ *Confession of Faith, Anno 1662.*” For it cannot
be prov’d that the *true Greek Church*, without any
Mixture of *Romish Priests and Fryars*, or *Latinizing*
Greeks, made that Confession of Faith; nay, it is
most likely, that *Popish Emissaries* had a great Hand
in making it: For Dr. Smith, in the 6th Page of
his Preface, to the above-cited Book, makes the
bold

bold Determinations of this very Confession of Faith, Anno 1662. and of the Bethleemetick Synod, said to have been Held in 1671. to be such Instances
“ as will incline any sober and considering Man to
“ believe, that the Greeks have of late, more than
“ ever, been wrought upon by the sly Artifices and
“ underhand Dealing of the subtle Emissaries of
“ Rome, who watch continually over the poor Greeks,
“ and take Advantage of their Poverty and Distress,
“ to bring them to a farther Compliance, and in time
“ to a downright Subjection.” So that upon a serious Consideration of the whole Matter, Mr. Bingham's producing these *Modern Instances* of some particular *Greeks* allowing of Baptism by Lay-men, and even by *Women*, amounts to no more, than if he had given us the like Instances from the *Church of Rome*; for 'tis well known, that, that Church has infected *some of the Greeks* with her false Doctrines and unwarrantable Practices, insomuch as that some of their late Synodical Determinations, and Confessions of Faith, have been made by the Instigation of Popish Priests, and founded upon *Romish Principles*, especially in some Doctrines and Practices which were never held or us'd in the Ancient *Greek Church*, as this of Baptism by Lay-men and *Women* never was, before some of their *Bishops* and *Clergy* were too easily wrought upon by the cunning Craftiness of Popish Emissaries in the *declining Ages of the Church*.

§ XIX. As for the *Moscovites*, Mr. Bingham says, pag. 109. *“ Their Rules and Canons give particular Orders about this matter ;”* and for Proof of this he says, pag. 110. That *“ the first Canon of*
“ John their Metropolitan, who is commonly call'd
“ their Prophet, gives this Direction, That Children,
“ in

“ *in Case of Necessity, should be baptiz’d without a*
“ *Priest.*” And this is all he produces for the
Practice of the *Moscovite Churches*; one *single Man’s*
Authority; no *Synod or Council* mention’d wherein
this Canon was made, and yet this must stand for
the *authentick Sense and Practice of those Churches*.
Strange arguing this! as if the Opinion of *One*
Bishop was the Opinion of *all those Churches*: But
the contrary to this is very evident from *Mr. Bingham’s*
own Observation, in the Words immediately
following, which are these; “ *The People indeed do*
“ *not always observe this Rule, for some Authors*
“ *tells us, many of them think a Priest so abso-*
“ *lutely requisite to perform this Office, that, what-*
“ *ever Case of Necessity happen, they will not per-*
“ *mit it to be done by any other but a Priest.*” From
whence ’tis plain, the *Moscovites* do not think their
Metropolitan to be in the right, tho’ he do’s say,
That “ *Children may be baptiz’d*” in Case of Ne-
cessity “ *without a Priest.*”

§ XX. But *Mr. Bingham* replies to this, That
“ *we are to judge of the Sense and Practice of a*
“ *Church from the Rules and Canons made by*
“ *its Governours, and not by the Practice of the*
“ *Vulgar, who often transgress their Rules, either*
“ *through Ignorance, Neglect or Contempt; in which*
“ *Case it would be injurious to any Church, to judge*
“ *of her Doctrines by the contrary Practice of the*
“ *common People.*” In return to this I must tell
our Reverend Historian, that there are some *first*
Principles in Christianity, which when the common
People have been thoroughly inform’d of, and ac-
custom’d to, they cannot be easily drawn from
them, but will persist in them, in *Opposition* to the
contrary *Novel Innovations* of some of their mi-

fallen Governours: It is easie to conceive upon what Principle some in high Stations may have been tempted to enact that which they ought not; and which the Vulgar, upon the *common Principles* of Christianity, are bound not to submit to: As for Instance;

“ * Several Bishops of Lithuania, and Russia-
 “ Nigra, who had hitherto continued in the Commu-
 “ nion of the Greek Church, wrought upon by several
 “ Temporal Advantages and Honours, which they
 “ propos’d to gain in the Diet and Government of
 “ Poland, sent Two of their Number to Rome, in
 “ the Year 1595, in order to their being reconcil’d
 “ to that Church.— But their going thither,
 “ and doing this in the Name of all the **Authentick**
 “ **Churches** was protested against, and a publick
 “ Act made of it by Constantine, Duke of Ostorovia,
 “ and several others who dislik’d this intended Union.”

Now ’tis easy to see how and upon what Motives those Bishops, if they had not been publickly oppos’d, might have caball’d together, and made *Rules and Canons* in favour of many of the *Corruptions* of the Church of Rome, which the *Moscovites* were never us’d to Practice; and ’tis as easie to see into the Reason, why the People, in such case, would for a long time have *persisted, in the Practice* of what their *Bishops and Priests* had all along before taught them, contrary to those Innovations: So that the Peoples not observing some singular Rule, made by one or some few of their Governours, is not *always* an Instance of their Ignorance, Neglect or Contempt of the *wholsome Laws* of their Church, but sometimes is a Proof of the Novelty and Corruption

* Dr. Smith’s Account of the Greek Church, p. 242, 243.

of the *Imposition*; and that the People have been accustom'd to be taught *better things*, and will therefore persist in their *ancient Customs and Practices*.

What Mr. Bingham observes, That "*we are to Judge of the Sense and Practice of a Church from the Rules and Canons made by its Governours, and not by the Practice of the Vulgar,*" is very true in some Cases, but not in all. 'Tis true, when Rules and Canons are made by *Synods* of the Bishops and other Clergy of a Church *fully and freely* assembled, then those Rules are the *Sense* of the governing Part of that Church; and when they are reduc'd to Practice, by the Members both Clergy and Laity, then they are the *Sense and Practice* of that Church: But of such *Rules and Canons* of the *Governours and Clergy* of the *Moscovite Churches*, Mr. Bingham has not given us one Instance. On the other hand, 'tis false to suppose when only *one Governour* of the Church makes, or some few cabal together to make, a *new Rule* or Canon to which that Church was not *before accustom'd*, that such a Rule or Canon is the *Sense and Practice* of that Church, 'tis no better than a *novel Imposition* of *one or some* of its particular Governours; and the Multitude of Peoples not taking any notice of, but acting contrary to it, *upon a religious Principle*, is an Argument that their Minds are prejudic'd against it, either by former *long Practice and Custom*, or else by the Instructions and Teachings of the greater Part of their Clergy, or both of these together; and in such case the Practice of the People, and not the Novel Canon made by a particular Bishop, shews the *Sense* of that Church; and this is the Case before us. *John the Metropolitan* of the *Moscovites*, has a particular Canon which affirms,

that Baptism in Time of Necessity may be given without a Priest: This Canon do's not appear to have been made by any Synod or Council of that Church, but by his singular Authority; the People, "*whatever Case of Necessity happens, will not permit it to be done by any other but a Priest*:" They regard not their Metropolitan's Canon; and why? Not thro' Ignorance or Neglect, as Mr. Bingham Insinuates, but from a Religious Principle; because they think No Man sufficient for this Holy Function, in any Case of Necessity whatsoever, but a Priest; as is plain by the * Author quoted by Mr. Bingham, in his 111th Page; and the same is also attested to by † Gerhard, another of this Reverend Gentleman's Authors.—And even Arcudius, a Romish Priest, another of our Historian's Authors, who wrote a Book, Printed in the Year 1626. to make the World believe that the Oriental Churches agreed with the Roman, is free enough to Acknowledge, || That "*for the most part all Grecia,*

* *Joh. Fabri. de Relig. Moscovit. p. 176. Huic muneri fungendo quæcunque Necessitas inciderit, Nemo hominum sufficere putatur nisi Sacerdos extiterit.*

† *Gerhard Loc. Com. Tom. 4. De Baptismo, n. 37. p. 242. In Moscovitas aliqui perhibent baptizandi muneri quæcunque necessitas inciderit, neminem hominum sufficere, nisi Sacerdos extiterit. In opere de variis rerum Moscovitic. Autorib. p. 136.*

|| Postquam de materia & forma Baptismi Egimus, superest ut de ministro aliquid dicamus: Quod eo alacrius aggredior, quo totam ferme Græciam, Russiam, Moscoviam, & alias Provincias quæ in fide Christi ritu Græco perseverant, ex imperitia in eo versari errore, scrupulo & religione animadverto; ut absente Presbytero malint permittere, ut Infantes si e Baptismo è vita decedant, quàm eos saluari lavacro abluere; quod existiment sibi laicis ne in necessitate quidem licere hoc munere fungi. *Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. & Occid. Lib. 1. c. xi. p. 24. Paris 1626.*

" Russia,

“ Russia, Moscovia, and other Provinces, who, after the manner of the Greek Church, continue in the Faith of Christ, when a Priest is Absent, had rather suffer their Infants to Die without [what he calls] “ Baptism, than suffer them to be baptiz’d [as he terms it] “ by any other, because they think that it is not Lawful, even in Necessity, for Laicks to Execute this Office.” He is pleas’d indeed to call this, their *Error*, and to say that it proceeds from their *Ignorance*, and want of Knowledge; but that is usual enough with *Romish Priests*; ’tis their Custom to call every Body that differs from the false Tenets of their Church, *Ignorant* and *Erroneous*; but that is no Proof, that they are so. Here are confessedly vast Multitudes of Christians, inhabiting far *Extended Kingdoms*, and Provinces, who hold, that *Laicks cannot Baptize*, even in want of *Priests*; ’tis a part of their Religion to think so; and in consequence of this, *no false Notions of Charity* and Natural Affection to their Tender Infants, can prevail with them to suffer *Laicks to meddle* in this Sacred Function, even in Times when no other can be had; no, they venture the Souls of their Children, and leave them to the Mercy of God, without attempting to secure their Salvation by *uninstituted, uncommanded*, and in their Opinion, *prohibited Ministrations*; they don’t think, they must do Evil, or what they think to be Evil, *that Good may come of it*; and whence should it come to pass, that Christians should, in such *prodigious Numbers*, run unanimously into this Opinion and Practice, of esteeming it better, and therefore suffering their Children *rather to Die without Lay-Baptism*, when Priests are not to be had, than let them be *profanely Wash’d by Laicks*? Do’s it not at least proceed

ceed from hence, that they have been us'd to be taught no other than *Priestly Baptism*? And that they have been accustom'd to no other? And who have been their Teachers, but the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of those Churches? They have not been us'd to the Impudent Usurpations of Unordain'd Lay-Teachers, as we are; so that this Opinion and Practice of theirs, being so Universal, must proceed originally from their own Clergy of the *Greek* and *Moscovite* Churches; and their persevering in them, in Opposition to some few singular Novel *Romish* Attempts to the contrary, must be attributed to this, that the *Romish* Priests and *Latinizing Greeks*, have not yet been so powerful in their Attempts, but that still the *Greeks* and *Moscovites* for the most part dissent from them in this Matter: We have no less than the Evidence of [*Ar-cudius*] a Modern *Romish* Priest for this, who wrote his Book on purpose to shew the Agreement of the *Eastern* Churches with the *Latin*; and who yet, when he comes to the Article of Baptism, is forc'd to acknowledge, that for the most part all Greece, Russia, Moscovy, and other Provinces in Communion with the *Greek Church*, dissent so very much from the *Roman Church* about the Minister of Baptism, as that they suffer their Children rather to Die without Lay-Baptism, when a Priest cannot be had, than let any Laick pretend to Baptize them; and purely upon this Principle, "That it is not Lawful, even in Times of Necessity, for Laicks to Execute the Office of Baptizing."

§ XXI. Having been thus long upon the Sense and Practice of the *Greeks* and *Muscovites*, I shall be the more brief upon that of the *Foreign Reform'd*; because, they can be no Evidence of the general

general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church, except they produce her Ecclesiastical Laws, Traditions, or Customs, [for the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd by Bishops to baptize] which I am sure they cannot do.

And first for the *Lutherans*; Mr. Bingham in his 111th Page, &c. introduces *some of them* asserting that "*any Person who is a Christian, Man, or Woman, may be the Extraordinary Minister of Baptism—when there is imminent Danger of Death, and a Minister of the Word cannot be had.*" And here we may easily see, that *these Lutherans* are so far *Popish*, in that they allow of Baptism by *Women*, which by Mr. Bingham's own Confession, *never was allow'd by the Ancient Catholick Church*; so that, in this of Baptism by *Women*, the *Lutherans* Mr. Bingham speaks of, are *Uncatholick*; and as for the other, of Baptism by *Lay-men*, we have abundantly seen already, that they have *No Catholick Principle* whereon to found that Practice, since the *Ancient Catholick Church* never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom for it. The supposed Reasons they give [as in his 112th and 113th Pages] for the Baptism of *Lay-men* and *Women*, are very weak, insignificant, and false, and have been already obviated and answer'd in several * Treatises published long since. Mr. Bingham himself do's not care to be concern'd "*what weight and force there is in their [pretended] Arguments,*" and

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid. Sacerdotal Powers. Dissenters Baptism Null and Void.*

therefore I will not trouble the Reader with them.

§ XXII. Mr. Bingham's next Instance is of the *Helvetic* Body, the Followers of *Zuinglius*, wherein he tells us [in his 114th and 115th Pages] that *Zuinglius* was of Opinion, "that Baptism (in Case of Necessity) might be given by Any Man, [*Quivis Hominum*] yea by a Woman also;" which is plainly the *Popish Novelty* in its full Extent, and therefore needs no further Confutation. "His Followers disapprov'd of this Latitude of Baptism by Women, and therefore after his Death prohibited it," says Mr. Bingham: So far they did well. But says our Reverend Historian, "No Prohibition was [by them] laid up- on Men, in Cases of Necessity, nor any Order made for Re-baptizing those who were irregularly baptiz'd by others." And what do's this signify more, than that they have laid aside one Piece of *Popery*, and not provided against another; that is, Baptism by Women is forbidden; but still [*Quivis Hominum*] Any Man, [as *Zuinglius* words it] may baptize: His Followers have not forbidden this; that is, they have not forbidden *Turks, Jews, or Pagans to Baptize*, so they be but Men, [for all this is included in *Zuinglius's Quivis Hominum, Any Man*] a very hopeful Reformation indeed! as Mr. Bingham has describ'd it; so that, we need not wonder why they made no Order for what he calls *Re-baptizing*. Thus far may suffice, for what Mr. Bingham has told us, of the *Popery* of some of the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*.

§ XXIII.

§ XXIII. And now for the Calvinists. Our Reverend Historian owns in his 115th Page, that
 “ Calvin freely declares his mind against the Law-
 “ fulness of Lay-Baptism in Any Case whatso-
 “ ever. That “ he thinks there can be No Ne-
 “ cessity sufficient to Authorize private Men or
 “ Women, to do the Office of a Publick Minister.
 Mr. Bingham tells his English Reader, that “ Calvin
 “ owns indeed, that the Contrary Practice had
 “ generally prevail’d, not only several Ages be-
 “ fore his own Time, but, in a manner, from the
 “ first beginning of the Church, Lay-men always
 “ baptized in danger of Death, If a Minister could
 “ not be had in due Time. But that He, [i. e. Cal-
 vin] thinks the Grounds they went upon were
 “ not justifiable.” By Mr. Bingham’s thus repre-
 senting the Sense of Calvin, the Reader may be in-
 duc’d to think, that Calvin could not but own, that
 Lay-Baptism had generally prevail’d, that is,
 had been the General Practice of the Catholick
 Church, and that Lay-men had always baptiz’d,
 &c. whereas in Truth, Calvin’s Words, as Mr.
 Bingham has ’em in his Margin, contain nothing
 that shews he own’d this to have generally pre-
 vail’d; not one Word that acknowledges “ Lay-
 “ men always Baptiz’d, &c.” For the whole of
 what he says is only, * That “ Many Ages before,”
 his Time, “ and so far, as almost from the first be-

* Calvin Instit. Lib. 4. cap. 15. N. 20. Quod autem multis
 ab hinc sæculis, adeoque ab ipsa fere Ecclesiæ exordio, usu re-
 ceptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis Laici Baptizarent, si mi-
 nister in tempore non adesset, non video quam firma ratione
 defendi queat.

“*ginning of the Church, it was a Receiv'd Custom* [he do's not say it *generally prevail'd*] “*that* “*Lay-men should Baptize*” [he do's not say Lay-men *always baptiz'd*] “*in danger of Death, if* “*a Minister could not be had in due Time; and* “*that He* [i. e. Calvin] *did not see how or by what* “*substantial Reason this*” Custom “*could be de-* “*fended.*” So that this Custom which Calvin thought was so early taken up, do's not appear from his Words, to have been own'd by him as a Practice that *Generally Prevail'd*; for a suppos'd Custom of some few singular Persons, may be call'd a Custom, and an early one too, without being the Custom or Practice of the Church it self: Some of the Members of the Church may have suppos'd *Practices* of their own, which never were own'd by the Church as *her Customs and Traditions*; so that, if Calvin reckon'd, that there was a receiv'd Custom *very early* for Lay-men to baptize in danger of Death, when Clergy-men could not be had; this do's not prove that he thought it was a Custom receiv'd by great Multitudes, much less that it *Generally Prevail'd*, as Mr. Bingham expresses it; and whoever they were, that by Calvin's Supposition took up this Custom [which by all that has been said before, was not by any one so early receiv'd as he [i. e. Calvin] fancy'd it, yet Calvin contemns their Authority, and plainly shews, that he thought their Practice could not be defended.

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. Bingham says in his 116th Page, that Calvin “*do's not peremptorily pronounce such Baptisms, absolutely Null and Void, but the contrary.*” And for this he quotes

quotes Arch-Bishop * *Whitgift's* Words, because they have these Expressions, viz. "It is sufficient for us to know the Hand and Seal of the Lord in his Sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered—we shall be sufficiently defended [i. e. against the Anabaptists, who deny'd Baptism to be right, because given by Idolatrous Persons in the Church of Rome] "if we think that we were Baptiz'd, not in the Name of any Man, but in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and therefore Baptism not to be of Man, but of God, by whomsoever it be minister'd. And because of this [whomsoever] Mr. Bingham concludes, that Calvin do's not absolutely Null and Void Baptism by Lay-men. But, in answer to this, if the word *whomsoever*, as Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* has it, must be taken in its full Extent and Meaning; then Calvin will be made to have esteem'd as Good and Valid, all the pretended Baptisms of Lay-men and Women, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Pagans, which is plainly a Novelty of **Corrupt Popery**. And not only so, but the Validity of Baptism by Private Persons, if it be included in this word *whomsoever*, will be an Inconsistency and Contradiction to what Mr. Bingham said before, viz. that "Calvin declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever;" and that "he thinks there can be no Necessity sufficient to Authorize private Men or Women to do the Office of a publick Minister;" so that, Calvin will be made to speak inconsistently with himself, and to contradict his own Principle. For, if Baptism by

* *Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. 9. p. 518. ex Calvin Instit. Cap. 17. Sect. 16.*

Lay-men, or Women, be not **Lawful** in any Case whatsoever; and there can be no Necessity sufficient to **Authorize** it [according to Calvin:] Then 'tis plain, that in Calvin's Opinion, such pretended Baptisms, have **No Law, Rule, or Authority**; for if they have, then they are **Lawful** and **Authoriz'd**, which Calvin says they are not; since then they have no **Law or Rule**, and are Destitute of any **Authority** in Calvin's Sense, it necessarily follows, that "*the Hand and Seal of the Lord cannot be in such false Ministrations, and therefore they are Invalid*;" for if the **Hand and Seal** of the Lord is in them, then they have **His Authority**, and are therefore **Lawful**, because the **Hand and Seal** of a **Principal**, really set to any Instrument, is either by himself, or his **Authoriz'd Attorney or Representative**, and so is **His**, and therefore **His Authority**; and consequently **Lawful**, and therefore **Valid**, because **His Hand and Seal**: But Calvin says on the contrary, that they are *not Lawful in any Case whatsoever*, no Necessity can be sufficient to **Authorize** them; therefore the **Hand and Seal** of the Lord cannot be in them, and consequently they cannot be **Valid**, by **whomsoever** perform'd, if we take *whomsoever*, in the full extensive Meaning of the Word, to include **Private Men and Women**, Persons never **Authoriz'd or Commission'd** to Baptize; that is, Calvin reckons such Baptisms **Valid**, by saying the **Lord's Hand and Seal** is in them; tho' by what he said before, they are **Invalid**, because utterly **Unlawful**, and void of **Authority**; except it can be prov'd, that, in this Case, *there is Validity* where there is **no Law, no Rule, no Hand and Seal of the Lord**, and **Nothing of His Authority**.

Thus

Thus we see *Calvin's* Inconsistency, if his *whomsoever* must be taken in the full Latitude of the Word, to include Lay, *i. e.* Uncommission'd Baptizers; and therefore they who would make him *Consistent* with himself, must understand by his *whomsoever*, only whomsoever "*Publick Minister,*" whether Reform'd Protestant, or *Idolatrous Papist*, since Arch-Bishop *Whitgift's* Words, taken from *Calvin*, were levell'd against the then *Anabaptists*, who deny'd Baptism to be Right, because given by *Idolatrous Baptizers* in the Church of *Rome*. For, 'tis plain, that *Calvin* not only declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever, as Mr. *Bingham* has rightly observ'd; but that the same *Calvin* did in a Publick and Authentick manner Sign to it *, that such Baptism is utterly Null and Void in expresse Terms, Witness his Hand to the *Publick Act of the Ministers and Doctors in the Church of Geneva*, [as they are call'd] who were at the National Synod of *Lyons*, Anno 1563. wherein, Article the First, it is expressly affirm'd that such Baptism "*is of No Force, Power, Validity, or Effect,*" and to which *John Calvin* sign'd his Name in full Length.

Mr. *Bingham* acknowledges that *Beza*, *Calvin's* Successor, "*declares positively against the Validity of Baptism administer'd by private Persons,* p. 116. And that it is certain the French Reform'd do all join with him "*in the Doctrine of the Invalidity and Nullity of Lay-Baptism,* p. 117. And it is

* As may be seen in *Quick's Synodicon*, Vol. 1. Chap. XXI. p. 50. Or more easily in a little Book, call'd, *The Judgment of the Reform'd in France, &c. Concerning the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, Page 16. Printed for H. Clements, Anno 1712.

notorious that this was asserted by them in no less than Six National Synods, namely, the First held at *Paris*, Anno 1559. the Second at *Poitiers* 1560. another at *Lyons* 1563. where the Deputies of *Geneva* were also present agreeing thereto; another at *Rochel* 1571. where *Beza* of *Geneva* was Moderator; the National Synod of *Gap*, Anno 1603. and that at *Rochel*, Anno 1607. to which Mr. *Bingham* adds another Synod of *Alençon* 1637. in his 118th Page, and justly concludes, that the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism “*is indisputably the Practice of the French Church,*” to which he should have added that of *Geneva* too, as is plain by two at least of those Seven Synods. These were full National Synods, and very solemnly held; and Mr. *Bingham* cannot produce such full flagrant Evidence among the *Lutherans*, for the other side of the Question.

Besides, he thinks that the *Dutch* also join with the *French* in this particular Page 119th, as he judges by the General Current of the *Dutch Writers*; so that here are no less than the *French* and the *Genevans*, in National Synods; and the *Dutch* also for us against the Validity of Lay-Baptism.

Mr. *Bingham* comes next to the *Palatines*, and says, Page 120. “*The Churches of the Palatinate, commonly follow the Doctrine of the Calvinists;*” So that here our Reverend Historian acknowledges, that the *Palatine* Protestants are commonly against the Validity of Lay-Baptism—very well. But says he, “*In One Case some of their Divines make an Exception, as in a Time of great Persecution, or Dispersion of the Ministry in some grand Dissipation of the Church.*” And for this he produces but One of their Divines, Dr. *Alt-ling*, who says, “*Baptism administer’d by private Men*”

“Men, in a grand Dispersion of the Church, is
“not to be reiterated.” But what signifies the
Saying of one Man only, among the *Palatines*,
when [according to Mr. Bingham] the Churches
of the *Palatinate* commonly follow the *Contrary*
Doctrine; especially, when 'tis also consider'd,
that this very Dr. *Alting*, says of this *same* *Bap-*
tism thus, “We do not say it is *Legitimate*, or
“*Lawful*,” and thereby is *inconsistent* with him-
self, and so we may leave him as a Doctor of no
Moment in this Affair; for, he brings false Argu-
ments against repeating the Baptism, which he ac-
knowledges to be *Unlawful* and *Illegitimate*,
and therefore *False* and *Invalid*. He endeavours
to prove, that they should not be repeated, “be-
“cause the *Jewish* Circumcisions and *Popish* *Bap-*
“*tisms* were not repeated, tho' they were per-
“form'd and attended with many Superstitions
“in the corrupt State of the *Jewish* and *Romish*
“Church.” As if Corruptions of Superstition, &c.
attending a *True Commission*, were just the same
as *no Commission* at all; the Fallacy of which be-
trays it self.

Thus we have seen the Thoughts of the Foreign
Reform'd in this Matter; we have observ'd from
Mr. Bingham, that some of the *Lutherans* and
Zuinglians are *very Popish* about it. And it has
been prov'd, that the *French Protestants*, the *Gene-*
vans, the *Dutch*, and the *Palatines*, do not sub-
mit to this *Corruption of Popery*; but have very
justly reform'd from it in Principle and Doctrine.

But says Mr. Bingham, “The Dutch and French
“Churches are [by some] reckon'd of no Account
“but *Anchur'd*, because they want *Episcopacy*,
“and consequently *True Ordinations*, and *Chri-*
“*stian Sacraments*, in their Opinion; and then
“what

“ what signifies their Testimony, in such a Case, if
 “ as soon as they have deliver’d their Evidence
 “ about Christian Baptism, they shall be Cashier’d,
 “ and positively declar’d to be no Christians? See
 his 119th Page. This of Unchurching has been
 long since answer’d in * another Place; and if
 some do hold that there are “ no True Ordinations
 “ and Christian Sacraments,” where there is no
 Episcopacy, they are very much in the right of it;
 and if Mr. Bingham do’s not approve of this,
 [which he emphatically calls] **Their Opinion**,
 [as if it were separate, and of another Nature,
 from what he Holds himself] then let him give
 us a *Scholastical History*, of the *Sense and Practice of*
the Church, in Defence of the *Contrary Principle*,
 if he is able; that so we may see from Authentick
 Testimonies, that there were anciently *True Or-*
dinations and Christian Churches and Sacraments
without Episcopacy. But this I am sure he will
 never be able to prove from any of the *Antiqui-*
ties of the Christian Church; for the direct contra-
 ry is notorious Matter of Fact, as is Evident both
 from Scripture and Ecclesiastical History, That
 there never was any *Christian Church, True Ordi-*
nations, or Christian Sacraments, without Episcopa-
cy, no one Instance whatsoever can be produc’d in
 Proof that there was; and therefore we must still
 Hold [what he calls] our Opinion, which is more
 than barely so, for ’tis an *Ancient Catholick*, and
 therefore a *Substantial Truth*.

And tho’ the French and Dutch are so deeply
 concern’d [as our Reverend Historian says some
 reckon them to be] in this Truth; yet still **Their**

* Lay-Baptism Invalid.

Evidence against Lay-Baptism is very *Significant*, and of great *Importance* both to themselves and us. For,

First, It shews *them* the great Necessity of securing to *themselves* a Real, and therefore Valid *Mission*; since, by their *own Confession*, they have no *Christian Baptism*, if their Baptizers are not in *Valid Holy Orders*. And,

Secondly, Their Evidence is a Benefit to us, because it shews the prevailing Power of Truth; which Men [seriously considering the Nature of Things] are obliged to submit to, even tho' themselves are involved in the Consequences of it. It is no small Motive of Credibility, when a Truth is attested to, not only by those who are its avowed *Friends*, and Practice according to it, but also by those very Men, who, in the Opinion of unprejudic'd Standers by, are oblig'd, considering their Circumstances, either to oppose and gainsay it, or else to reform their own Practice, that they may be truly consistent therewith. It is a pleasant and delightful thing, to see Men in love with **Truth in the Abstract**: It is no Abatement of the Truth how much soever they are concern'd in the *Consequences* which they *themselves* have made; those Consequences **may indeed** [and ought to] **be re-form'd**, but the Truth they are Witnesses for, is *unchangeable*, and is not in the least alter'd by their contrary, irregular *Circumstances* and *Practices*. *Nathan's Parable* to King *David* contain'd an excellent Truth, of the great Deformity, and heinous Demerit of Mens acting contrary to the Rules of *Justice* and *Equity*. *David* assented to this Truth; and in the Case that *Nathan* put to him was so *very zealous*, that he, like a Just and Righteous Judge, resolv'd, that the Man who was guilty of

S

the

the Injustice *Nathan* complain'd of, *should surely die*. The King did not reckon, that the *Application* was to be made to himself; no matter for that, the Truth was still the same: And when *Nathan* said unto him, "**T**hou art the Man;" he still acknowledg'd the Truth he had assented to before, he submitted to the Justice of the Sentence himself had pronounc'd, and sincerely repented of, without endeavouring to excuse or extenuate, the *Occasion* which himself had given for *Nathan's* Parable; and God grant that the *French*, and the *Dutch*, and other Reform'd abroad, &c. may go and do likewise, so as really to put in *Practice* what is agreeable to, and *consistent* with their own avowed *Principles*, in the matter before us!

As for what *Mr. Bingham* says of the Church of *England*, and Sense of her Members, from his 122d, to his 137th Page, it is needless to repeat in Answer thereto what has been already said in * *Treatises* already published, and in which our Reverend Historian's Remarks are *obviated* and *answer'd*: And therefore the Reader is referr'd to them, that I may now proceed to sum up the whole Evidence of the Antients in the next Chapter, and so conclude.

* *Dissenters and other unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void by the Articles, Canons and Rubricks of the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford's Charge Consider'd.*

C H A P. VIII.

The whole Evidence of Antiquity sum'd up; proving, That the far greater Majority of Ancient Testimony, is against all pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons, who never were authoriz'd by Bishops to baptize, and consequently that such Baptisms are not valid by any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition or Custom of the ancient Catholick Church: The Conclusion containing a true State of the Question about suppos'd Cases of Necessity, where Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptizers are not to be had.

WE have already seen in Chap. 3. That the ancient Catholick Church never attempted to *Authorize or Commission* Lay-men to baptize, in any Case whatsoever; and that all the *Endeavours* of this sort have been made only by *some few particular Persons*, who can upon no account whatsoever be said to make up, **The ancient Catholick Church**; and whose Attempts, if they were right, are also of no Importance to favour the Practice of those who have not even so much as any Pretence to this *suppos'd Authority*, and Commission, from Bishops to baptize, as certainly our Laicks [the Dissenting Teachers] have not.

It remains now that I sum up the whole Evidence relating to Baptisms perform'd by a *real* [or *suppos'd*] *Episcopal Commission*, and concerning other pretended Baptisms by Persons who never had such a Commission at all, that the Reader may,

in a narrow Compass, see the whole Evidence of the Antients for and against these *never-Commission'd Baptisms*, and pass Judgment accordingly: And that he may do it the more easily, I note the Whole in the following Table, in which the Antients, &c. who are thought to have been for *Baptisms* by Persons *never Commission'd* by Bishops, are noted on the Left-side; and those, whose Evidence is for Baptisms perform'd by Episcopal Authority only, are on the Right, with the Pages in this Book, where their several Testimonies, and the Arguments thereupon, are to be found, thus:

The Antients, &c. whose Testimonies are thought to make for the Validity of Baptism by Persons never Commission'd by Bishops.

The Antients, &c. whose Testimonies make for Baptism perform'd by Episcopal Authority only, and who Null Unauthoriz'd Baptisms.

Jesus Christ, in his Institution of Baptism, gave his Commission only to his Apostles, the first Bishops, and to such as they and their Successors should Authorize, Page 5. This Commission to continue to the End of the World, and necessary to preserve the Church according to the

the Order of Christ,
as Mr. Bingham owns,

p. 5.
The Truth of this Nulls
Uncommission'd Bap-
tisms, *p. 6, 28.*

None baptiz'd at first
but by Authority re-
ceiv'd from the Apo-
stles, according to one
of Mr. Bingham's Au-
thors, *p. 7.*

No one can have a Power
of Baptizing, but he
who receives some
way or other, a Com-
mission from them, ac-
cording to Mr. Bing-
ham's said Author, *p. 8.*

The Original Power of
Baptizing lodg'd sole-
ly and entirely in Bi-
shops, and derivative-
ly convey'd from them
to others, ordinarily
and extraordinarily,
according to Mr. Bing-
ham, *p. 11.*

Baptism by such Persons
was reputed as the Bi-
shop's Act, *ibid.*

Lay-men always debarr'd
from Baptizing in all
ordinary Cases, ac-
cording to Mr. Bing-
ham, *p. 30.*

He owns that **particular Churches** would not allow *Lay-men* to baptize in want of the Clergy, p. 32.

I. and II. Centuries.

I. and II. Centuries.

St. Ignatius says, "Without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," there is no Church, p. 35.

And without the Bishop it is not *Lawful* to baptize, p. 35.

St. Hermas names no other than *Authoriz'd* Baptizers for greatest Extremities, p. 38.

III. Century.

Tertullian, about Anno 200, thinks *Lay-men* have a *Right* in themselves to baptize in absence of the Clergy, p. 39.

But founds it upon a false Principle, which allows Women to baptize, p. 45.

III. Century.

Tertullian refers us to the Practice of the Church whereby the Bishop had the Power of Baptism, and after him Presbyters and Deacons, yet **not** without the **Authority** of the **Bishop**, p. 39, 41.

He will not allow Women to baptize, p. 47.

St. Cyprian makes Baptism without a Priestly Power, *i. e.* Episcopal Commission, to be Null and Void, p. 48.

Firmilian does the same, p. 54.

Novatus

Novatus à *Thamugade*,
the same, p. 55.

Confessor *Pomponius* à
Dionysiana, do's so like-
wise, p. 55.

Confessor *Clarus* à *Mas-*
cula the same, p. 56.

The XLVII Canon call'd
Apostolical, nulls Bap-
tism for the same Rea-
son, p. 57.

IV. Century.

IV. Century.

Nineteen Bishops in the
Spanish Council of Eli-
beris, made a Canon,
which [according to
Mr. Bingham] vested
some of their own Lay-
men, but not all, with
Authority to baptize in
want of the Clergy;
but this with parti-
cular Limitations and
Restrictions, p. 58.

So this Council is of no
Benefit for unautho-
riz'd Baptisms, but the
direct contrary. p. 59.

The Author of the Life
of *Athanasius* in *Pho-*
tius, supposes that the
Boy *Athanasius* bap-
tiz'd his Play-fellows
by a Divine In-
stinct, p. 72.

About this time comes
in the Fable of the
Boy *Athanasius* bapti-
zing his Play-fellows
in Sport, and the pre-
tended Determination
of Bishop *Alexander*,
that the Baptism was
Valid, refuted at large,
p. 62.

Optatus, Bishop of *Milevis*, [if his Words are taken in their full Latitude] allows of Baptism not only by *Christian Lay-men*, but also by *Women*, nay by unbaptiz'd *Infidels*, *Jews*, or *Pagans*, even in ordinary Cases, p. 103.

And this he judg'd from *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination about it, p. 88. Therefore [in his Opinion] *Alexander* took it for a divinely Authoriz'd Baptism, *ibid.* Mr. *Bingham* says, It would be strange! if any Canon should be made in the Church for such ludicrous Baptisms, p. 90. Fifty Years after the Council of *Eliberis*; *Hilary*, the Deacon of *Rome* Witnesses, that Lay-men did not then baptize, p. 97. *Pacian*, Bishop of *Barcelona*, teaches, that the New Birth cannot be effected but by Episcopal Baptism, p. 99. *Optatus's* Words candidly interpreted, speak only of Baptism administer'd by the then ordinary Ministers of Baptism, whether Catholics or Schismatics; and they were Episcopally Commission'd, p. 106.

St.

But Mr. Bingham acknowledges this Latitude was never allow'd by the Church; and that 'tis a Novelty of Popery, p. 105.

St. Jerom reckons it frequently Lawful for Lay-men to baptize; but this when Necessity compels, p. 120. He refers to no Law of God, or the Catholick Church for this, p. 121. His false Maxim whereon he founds this Power of Lay-men, p. 122. This Assertion of his, inconsistent with his Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, p. 131.

St. Basil, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, Nulls Lay-Baptism, p. 109.

St. Chrysostom, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, do's the same, p. 114.

The Constitutions call'd Apostolical do so likewise, p. 117.

St. Jerom, derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to baptize, from the Original Power of the Bishop, p. 120.

If St. Jerom on the other side, means that some Bishops authoriz'd Lay-men to baptize in Case of Necessity, then 'tis plain his Evidence is only for what he thought were Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptisms, p. 122.

He Nulls Lay-Baptism in his Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, in which he confutes their Assertion, that Arian Priests were Laicks, by this Principle, "That if they were Laicks, the Baptisms administer'd by them ought to be rejected, p. 123, &c.

He

St. Augustin allows of the **Validity** of Baptism in ordinary as well as extraordinary Cases, tho' perform'd by any **Man**; which includes **Jews** and **Pagans** as well as **Christians**, *p. 143, 154, &c.* He founds uncommis- sion'd Baptisms upon **hearsay Stories**, *p. 143, 147.* And false, or rather no **Arguments**, *p. 148, 151, 156.* In expounding Scripture he follow'd a **Path wholly new**, *p. 161.*

He says, That without **Priests** there is **no Church**; therefore say **I, no Baptism**, *p. 139.*

St. Augustin, as quoted by **Gratian**, speaking of Lay-mens bapti- zing in Case of Ne- cessity, founds it upon **Authority** of **Commission** descend- ed by **Bishops** from the **Apostles**, *p. 144.*

Another Passage of his as quoted by **Gratian**, which Nulls Baptisms by our **Laicks**, *p. 146.*

St. Augustin hesitates a- bout the **Validity** of **usurped Lay-Baptism** in time of supposed **Necessity**, *p. 151.*

He is not **positive**, but such a **Usurpation** is a **Sin**. *p. 153.*

Therefore 'twas not the **general Sense** and **Prac- tice** of the **Church**, *p. 153, 154.*

He acknowledges that the **Validity** of **Lay- Baptism** in ordinary Cases [tho' his own **Opinion**] was not the **Determination** of any **general Council**, con- sequently

sequently 'twas not
the general Sense of
the ancient Catholick
Church, p. 155.

He calls such Baptisms
**unlawful Usurpa-
tions**; and says, That
the unlawful Usurpa-
tion must be *corrected*
by a sincere and affe-
ctionate *Repentance*,
else the *Baptism* will
remain to the **Punish-
ment** of the *Giver*
and *Receiver*, p. 154.
This is in effect a Null-
ing of such Baptisms,
p. 157.

V. Century.

V. Century.

Gelasius, Bishop of Rome,
restrains the Office of
Baptizing in *ordina-
ry* and *extraordinary*
Cases to Persons *au-
thoriz'd* by Bishops,
p. 162, 164.

VI. Century.

Gratian makes *Isidore*
say, That Baptism by
a *Pagan* is **Valid**.

VI. Century.

Isidore, Bishop of Sevil,
in Spain, do's the like,
p. 165.

Mr. Bingham makes the
Sum of his whole Evi-
dence to be, that for
the first Six hundred
Years of Christianity,
the

the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* was this; That Baptism, whether in *Ordinary or extraordinary Cases*, was administer'd either by the Bishop himself, or else by such as had, [or were suppos'd to have had] *Apostolick, i. e. Episcopal Authority or Commission* to baptize, p. 169.

And that the Question of usurp'd and unauthoriz'd Baptism by Lay-men, is a *more difficult Question*; and he cannot resolve, that their Validity has any *Catholick Tradition of the Church*, whereon to suppose it grounded, p. 189.

The *Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, allowed of by some Churches, were not Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal Lay-Baptisms; this prov'd from the *general Council of Nice, the African Code, and Mr. Bingham's own Account of 'em*, p. 193.

Mr. Bingham endeavours to represent as *Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal*, the *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms* which were allow'd to be Valid by some *ancient Churches*.

So that upon a just Consideration of this Table, and all that has been said before, 'tis evident, that the Sum Total of all that our Reverend Historian and I have have said upon this Subject, is, That the ancient Catholick Church never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom, in Favour of the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by those, who are notoriously known to have been never Commission'd by Bishops to baptize. If Men will then venture to pronounce them Valid, 'tis plain that they have no Law of God, or of *his ancient Catholick Church*, whereon to found such a *Determination*. And therefore it must be done upon some private Principle of their own: But from such fatal Practices, I pray God to deliver and preserve his Church for ever.

I shall without any the *least Pedantry* conclude with these following Observations about suppos'd *Cases of Necessity*, concerning which some [without any Necessity at all] do make so great a Bustle.

1st, Supposing a Person duly qualified for Baptism, but not Baptiz'd, should be in such Circumstances, as that he could not possibly obtain Baptism, tho' from a duly Ordained Priest there present, but with an *Uninstituted Form*, not in the Name of the Trinity; the Priest, for Supposition's sake, being an *Anti-Trinitarian*: If this Person should desire Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, and yet accept of this *False Baptism*, reckoning it to be Right, because he can have no Other; 'Tis plain, he is *not actually Baptiz'd*, notwithstanding the suppos'd Necessity, and therefore is not in *Actual Covenant* with God; and consequently, if he Dies without True Baptism, he must be left to God's Uncovenanted Mercy; but with this Disadvantage, That he acquiesces in a Sin, though ignorantly, to make the best of it. —

2^{dly},

2dly, Supposing this Person to have a right sense of his Duty, and to Die with the Refusal of this False Baptism, because 'tis contrary to the Institution; 'tis plain, he Dies *Unbaptiz'd*, and so is not in *Actual* Covenant with God, and therefore must be referr'd to the same Uncovenanted Mercy; but with this great Advantage on his side, That he would do his Duty, but cannot: He knows 'tis sinful to Break the Institution; and consequently, through a pious, just fear of Transgressing, will not admit of an Uninstituted Form, and consequently, of False Baptism instead of the True: He trusts to Uncovenanted Mercy, with the Advantage of not breaking God's Law to obtain it: And let any one in his Senses judge, which of the Two is the *safest* to be chosen. So,

3dly, A Baptism *with the Form in the Name of the Trinity*, perform'd by a **Person never Commission'd** to Baptize, tho' done *when no Commission'd Person can be had*, is as much a Breach of the *Institution* as the other, and therefore we must have recourse to *Uncovenanted Mercy* for its Acceptance: For by *what Covenant* has God obliged himself to accept of it? But then our Confidence in this Mercy is abated, nay, is liable to be confounded, by our Sin and Presumption, in doing and acquiescing in a *sinful Ministration*, which is a Breach of the *Essential Law of God* about this Matter. Whereas,

4thly and Lastly, By refusing the *Never-commission'd Pretender*, when we can have *No Commission'd* Baptism, we express our *Pious* Regard to the *Divine Institution*; we show, That we must not do or acquiesce in *Evil*, with a design that *Good may come of it*: But we refer ourselves to the *Divine Mercy*, without venturing to break his Law; and so

so we escape the Imputation of Presumption, and are the more capable Objects of his Pity and Compassion, tho' we have no Claim to it by virtue of an *Explicit Baptismal Covenant*, when we Die in this Case without the *Instituted Ministration* of Baptism by a Commission.

In short, Upon the present Supposition, Persons pretendedly Baptiz'd by Non-commission'd Usurpers, and so Dying, must be referr'd to an *Uncovenanted Mercy* for Acceptance, [because they were not receiv'd into Covenant by the *Instituted Ministration*;] as must also others, who [refuse those False Baptisms, and] Die without True Baptism, because they cannot procure *Commission'd Baptism*. But the difference to the *Disadvantage* of the first is very great, for their Case is attended with Sin, even in the Baptized himself, when he consents to, acquiesces in, defends, and never endeavours to amend the Usurpation, [as is the Case of too many with us, who are come to Years of Discretion, &c.] Whereas *these latter*, who so Die without *Commission'd Baptism*, are so far from having any Sin to answer for, upon the account of *refusing an Uncommission'd Usurper's Act*, that their very Refusal of it, was an Act of Piety and Religion; and therefore their and our Confidence in God's Mercy, is much better founded, while 'tis thus free from the base alloy of Presumption.

And it were to be wish'd, that they who talk so much of *pretended Cases of Necessity*, [especially among us, where there are really none] would seriously consider, which of these Two is the *safest Way*; and the very great Danger of Encouraging People to sit down contented with that, which themselves acknowledge to be a Sin, when 'tis so easie among us to correct and amend it

it, by a *Validly Commission'd Baptism*, every-where to be obtain'd, if those who have Power will but administer it, and they who want it will but qualifie themselves to receive and seek for it.

But I Conclude; Humbly and Earnestly Praying to Almighty God, “*Who gathers his Flock out of all Nations into the Saving Fold of One Catholic Church; Who has also appointed divers Orders [Bishops, Priests, Deacons] in his Church,*” [in their several Degrees and Stations, to represent the Great Mediator between God and Man, Christ Jesus, for this Sacred Purpose;] “*That He would be pleas'd to Inspire All Bishops and their Clergy, with Courage and Skill, and Fatherly Care, to Edifie and Guard their several Charges;*” to keep that which is committed to their Trust, and in Christ's stead, here on Earth, to Open the Kingdom of Heaven to all Believers: That he would Bless all the Laity “*with a filial Love, and due Obedience to their Spiritual Superiors;*” That the *Clearness of Truth, and Beauty of Holiness, daily increasing in his Church,* through every one's devout Pursuance of their Duties, all Hereticks and Schismatics” may be converted, and “*all Jews and Pagans be happily won into her Sacred Bosom the sole Ark of Salvation;*” through the Power and Merits of the *Eternal Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord,* To whom with his Eternal Father, and the Holy Ghost, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son; *Three Persons, but One Incomprehensible God!* be all Honour, Praise, and Glory, Might, Power, Majesty and Dominion, for Ever and Ever, Amen.

F I N I S.



Laurence, Roger,

Lay-Baptism Invalid

Bd.: 2

London 1723

Liturg. 681 p-2

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10590749-6